Published on the 15th of the month.

Vol. XXV, No. 12. MARCH, 1936.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.
ASSISTANT EDITOR: M. T. DUNLOP, M.A.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
Signs of the Times:	
Politics and Religion	653
Jesus Christ and Politics	654
Christianity and Communism	654
The Demand for the Evolutionary Point of View	657
Evolutionary Christianity	660
Communism and Socialism	660
Lord Charnwood and Lord Wolmer	661
The Sources of the Second Gospel Eric Rede Buckley, M.A.	664
How has God Spoken? J. Hope Urwin.	669
Christology in the Twentieth Century The Editor.	675
Catholicism with Freedom W. Norman Pittenger.	682
In Memoriam—Alfred Caldecott W. R. Matthews, D.D.	687
Book Reviews	690
Correspondence	708

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

Price 1/- net. Annual Subscription, 10/6.

AMERICAN AGENT:
MRS. CHARLES E. COCKEY, 1423 Linden Avenue, Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

Entered as Second Class Matter, July 18, 1931, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., under the Act of March 3, 1879 (Sec. 397, P.L.& R.).

The Modern Churchmen's Union

FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF LIBERAL RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.

Inaugurated at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

President:

The Very Rev. W. R. MATTHEWS, K.C.V.O., D.D., Dean of St. Paul's.

Vice-Presidents:

Preb. A. CALDECOTT, D.D., D.Litt.
Prof. PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., F.B.A.
The Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY, M.A. [F.B.A.
The Very Rev. W. R. INGE, K.C.V.O., D.D.,
The Rev. Prof. F. J. FOAKES JACKSON, D.D.
Sir LAWRENCE JONES, Bart., M.A.
R. W. MACAN, Esq., D.Litt.
The Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.
The Rev. W. D. MORRISON, LL.D.
CYRIL NORWOOD, Esq., D.Litt.
The Very Rev. A. PAGE, M.A.
The Rev. Canon H. P. PLUMPTRE, M.A.
The Rev. KARL REILAND, D.D.
The Rev. Canon H. R. L. SHEPPARD, C.H., D.D.
Rev. Canon B. H. STREETER, D.D., F.B.A.

Members of the Council, 1935-36:

Chairman—Rev. E. ST. G. SCHOMBERG, M.A.

Rev. Canon HAROLD ANSON, M.A.
Miss A. M. ASHLEY, M.A.
Rev. Canon J. S. BEZZANT, B.D.
Rev. J. S. BOYS-SMITH, M.A.
Ven. Archdeacon W. M. BROWNE, M.A.
Rev. J. F. CLAYTON, M.A.
The Hon. GILBERT COLERIDGE, M.A.
Rev. L. B. CROSS, M.A.
Rev. F. G. GIVEN-WILSON, M.A.
Rev. R. G. GRIFFITH, M.A.
Rev. G. L. H. HARVEY, M.A.
R. B. HENDERSON, Esq., M.A., B.D.
Mrs. HOWSE.
Miss H. HUBBARD.
Rev. R. R. LEWIS, B.A.
Rev. Canon W. H. MACKEAN, D.D.
Rev. F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT, B.A.
CLAUD MULLINS, Esq.
Rev. HERBERT PEGG.
Rev. Canon C. E. RAVEN, D.D.
Rev. F. I. L. REES, B.A.
Rev. R. D. RICHARDSON, M.A., B.Litt.
Rev. A. F. ROBSON, M.A.
Rev. Canon T. GUY ROGERS, M.C., B.D.
A. H. SELF, Esq., B.A., B.Sc., B.D.
W. F. STIFF, Esq.
Ven. Archdeacon V. F. STORR, M.A.
Rev. Professor NORMAN SYKES, D.Phil.
Rev. H. J. TRUEMAN, M.A.
H. F. WALKER, Esq.
J. W. WALKER, Esq., M.D., O.B.E., F.S.A.
Miss DOROTHY WARD.
Rev. J. R. C. WEBB, B.D.
DOUGLAS WHITE, Esq., M.D.
J. WHEELER WILLIAMS, Esq.

Office—THE CHURCH HOUSE, WESTMINSTER, S.W.1.
Organizing Secretary—Rev. T. J. WOOD, M.A., St. John's Vicarage, 384 Clapham Road, [S.W.9.
Assistant Secretary—Miss DOWELL.
Hon. Treasurer—Sir JOHN BARRAN, Bart., Sawley Hall, Ripon.
Hon. Librarian—THE ORGANIZING SECRETARY.
Auditors—Messrs. PRIDEAUX, FRERE, BROWN & Co., 12 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, London, W.C.2.
Hon. Secretary to the Annual Conference—Miss HILDA HUBBARD, Kingsbridge, Steeple Claydon, [Bucks.
Bankers—MIDLAND BANK, METHODIST HALL BRANCH, S.W.1.

AIMS OF THE MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION

1.—To affirm the progressive character of God's self-revelation, and the certainty that no truth can lead away from Him.
2.—To proclaim Christ and His Gospel in the light of modern knowledge, endeavouring to give a clear meaning to all phrases which are open to ambiguous treatment.
3.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church of England to reject what is false and to restate what is true in her traditional dogmas.
4.—To defend the freedom of responsible students, clerical as well as lay, in their work of criticism and research.
5.—To promote the study of the Bible according to modern critical methods, and to interpret its message in the light of such study.
6.—To secure more regard for beauty and truth in Church Services and the use of language and customs in harmony with modern thought.
7.—To promote the application of Christian principles in public as well as in private life.
8.—To assert the right and duty of the laity to take a due share in the government and work of the Church.
9.—To maintain the historic comprehensiveness of the Church of England and to foster fellowship and co-operation with other Christian Societies.

Annual Subscription.—Members, at least 10/-; Associates, 1/-, payable in January; Life Membership, £10. Cheques should be made payable to The Modern Churchmen's Union, and crossed 'Midland Bank, Wesleyan Hall, S.W.1.'

All communications as to membership, subscriptions, changes of address, and business matters should be sent to—

The Organizing Secretary, Modern Churchmen's Union, Church House, Westminster, S.W.1.

EASTER EVE

Reflections on the possibility of living a human life that possesses value

by AMBROSIUS CZAKÓ

Of Toronto. sometime Professor of Philosophy and Pedagogy in the Teachers' Training College, Budapest

5s. net

With an Introductory Letter by

NATHANIEL MICKLEM, M.A.

Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford

¶ This book is an attempt to prove the absoluteness of Christianity. For this purpose, the author deals with creative activity as it manifests itself in art, morals, scientific investigation and daily life, regarding all these phenomena as problems of a philosophy of effort. He does not demand a special knowledge from his readers, all he asks for is that artistic appreciation, moral life, scientific work and daily life should become problems of the reader's consciousness.

The work was meant for those for whom the meaning of life has become problematical, and do not regard it as settled by any dogmatic statement.

METHOD IN YOUR PRAYERS

by A. F. THORNHILL, M.A.

2s. 6d. net

¶ 'An invaluable possession expressing a personal need.'

—*The Times Literary Supplement.*

THE EPISTLES AND GOSPLES FOR THE SUNDAYS AND GREATER HOLY DAYS OF THE CHRISTIAN YEAR

A New Translation together with a Selection of New Prayers

by the REV. T. F. ROYDS, B.D.

2s. 6d. net

¶ '. . . the little book is an interesting experiment and repays the trouble of detailed examination.'—*The Times Literary Supplement.*

A BOOK OF PRAYERS

for Various Seasons and Sundry Occasions

by A. CAMPBELL FRASER, M.A.

2s. 6d. net

¶ 'This little manual contains a large number of prayers selected from the best ancient sources ; but the editor has given a distinctive quality to it by adding a number of prayers of his own composition very closely related to the conditions of modern life.'—*The Listener.*

BASIL BLACKWELL • OXFORD

FOR CRIPPLED AND ORPHANED GIRLS

320 crippled girls are being taught at Edgware and Clerkenwell how to make artificial flowers. Eighty can use one hand only. Some are **blind.** Some are deaf and dumb. Some are unable to walk. All are being educated to earn their own living.

200 bright faced children are being trained for womanhood at the Orphanage at Clacton-on-Sea, under the affection and care of their "House Mothers."

70 years ago this work was started. It has been maintained ever since by the generosity of the public.

Please aid our work

Contributions gratefully acknowledged.

EDWARD COOKE, *Superintendent.* ALFRED G. GROOM, *Secretary.*

JOHN GROOM'S CRIPPLEAGE & FLOWER GIRLS' MISSION

(INCORPORATED). (Registered under the Blind Persons Act, 1920).

"The Crippleage," (Dept. Z), 37 Sekforde Street, Clerkenwell, London, E.C.1.

● *A copy of the last Report and Accounts will be sent on application.*

Will you make the Mission one of your legatees ?

CROMER CONVENTION

JUNE 20th—27th, 1936.

SUBJECT :

'Christ and Freedom.'

SPEAKERS :

The Bishops of Ripon, Croydon, Hong Kong, & Hull ; Archdeacon V. F. Storr ; Professors L. W. Grensted, T. E. Jessop and C. E. Raven ; Canon J. S. Bezzant ; The Reverends E. S. Abbott, L. B. Cross, H. McGowan, O. R. M. Roxby, and Leslie D. Weatherhead ; A. G. Pite, Esq., M.A.

For particulars apply to : The Hon. Sec., A. E. G.M., 16 Church House, Westminster. S.W.1.

Enquiries for
ADVERTISEMENT SPACE
in the

MODERN CHURCHMAN

should be sent to the sole advertising contractors

A. DARBY'S ADVERTISING SERVICE

Cobham House,
24 & 26 Water Lane, London, E.C.4.

Telephone : City 6686-7
Telegrams : "Darbiads," Cent, London.

All literary contributions should be addressed to :-
The Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, Ripon Hall, Boar's Hill, Oxford.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 12. MARCH, 1936. Vol. XXV.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Politics and Religion.

The First Gospel preserves an enigmatic utterance of Jesus derived from a primitive collection of His sayings (Q): 'The Kingdom of Heaven suffereth violence and violent men seize on it as booty' (Mt. xi, 12; *cf.* Lk. xvi, 16). Commentators of course differ, but Jesus would seem to be referring here to the strenuous efforts which the Zealots, or violent revolutionaries of that day and country, were making to utilize His Gospel of the Kingdom of God for their purposes of political revolt. Vital and vigorous religious movements have always been the prey of the politicians. An ancient sage once said to a king who had shown him his treasury: 'If one come who has better iron than thou hast he shall have all thy gold.' Ancient sages were, however, simple men compared with modern politicians. All astute observers recognize to-day that force is not enough. It must be supplemented by propaganda: and what better instrument for propaganda than religion, which can move so deeply the hearts of men and inspire them to a heroism and devotion which is no small element of success in any cause which it espouses. It is natural enough therefore that both communists and capitalists, who are the two great political forces in the modern world, should seek the assistance of the Christian religion, and strive to demonstrate to the Christian Churches that their Christian principles and duty demand imperatively that they should sup-

port the one party whole-heartedly, and oppose the other no less strenuously. The Christian, however, feels, in most cases, great doubt whether his Christian duty does demand his active, and whole-hearted support of political, social, and economic revolution, especially when it is clear that such a revolution will not receive the voluntary support of a great number of his fellow-human beings, and can only be achieved by force; and to judge by the witness of the past, bloodshed and tyranny.

Jesus Christ and Politics.

If anything is certain to the critical student of the Gospels, it is that Jesus was not a political revolutionary. He was opposed to violence, He advocated support of the existing order, although that order was an imperialist tyranny. The good life, in His view, was compatible with obedience to Caesar: Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's. And if Jesus was not a political revolutionary He was as little a political communist. When one said to Him: 'Bid my brother divide the inheritance with me,' He replied: 'Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you? Take heed, and keep yourselves from all covetousness.'

The basis of the Gospel of Jesus, the Kingdom of God, was neither economic, nor political. The mystical narrative of His temptation indicates this. He will neither turn stones into bread at Satan's bidding, nor fall down and worship him, although he, Satan, has the power to give to whomsoever he would all the Kingdoms of the world and the glory of them.

It is these assured results of Gospel study which to-day seem to many Christians to justify their refusal to accept the invitation of either communists or capitalists to support their cause as essentially Christian. Their attitude and the reasons for it are set forth with lucidity and cogency in Professor Peabody's *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, certainly not a recent book but one whose teaching is not out-of-date.

Christianity and Communism.

There is to-day a growing party of Christian communists who hold that the neutral attitude observed by many Christians in the conflict of communism with capitalism is obscurantist, cowardly, selfish: in short diabolical. 'Simply devilish' was

the term which, in our hearing, one of the most notable of our English Christian communists applied to Professor Peabody's book. When good Christian men differ so acutely on a subject of this importance, it is a positive duty to examine the reasons for their difference. Materials for such an examination have been provided in a recent volume, *Christianity and the Social Revolution*.[1] It is a book of Essays dealing mainly with what have been, are, and ought to be the relations of the Christian Church to communism. A number of the essayists are outstanding, notably Professor Raven, Professor John Macmurray, Joseph Needham, Karl Polanyi, Reinhold Niebuhr, Julius Hecker, Conrad Noel, John Lewis, Wystan Auden, Gilbert Clive Binyon and Bruno Meier. Not all are Christians, and it is not certain that all are communists, though all are sympathetically disposed towards communism. They all see, however, that Christianity can be of great assistance to the communist cause in its present struggle with capitalism, and that in various ways: either by inducing the Christians to withhold all support from capitalism and remain passive, or else, better far, by getting them to give their whole-hearted support to communism. Some of the writers, as thorough-going Marxian communists, hold that the Christian religion has no place whatsoever in their scheme of the future, not because the Christian religion is a feeble, unreal thing, but because it is essentially detrimental to the realization of communist ideals. It is the opiate of the people —the people being the proletariat, who, if they are Christian, cannot be incited to support a policy of ruthless class warfare. But the majority of the essayists seem to hold that communism is essentially Christian. Spengler asserted that Christianity was the grandmother of Bolshevism; presumably Tolstoianism being its father and Marxianism its mother. But these metaphors must not be pressed too hard.

Certainly, in its long history, Christianity has produced a number of communist movements, whether it be that of the Primitive Church of Jerusalem, where 'not one of them said that aught of the things which he possessed was his own,' or the monastic and preaching orders of the Middle Ages, or the Anabaptist movement in Germany in the sixteenth century whom their Lutheran opponents slew like mad dogs, or the English

[1] Published by Victor Gollancz, pp. 526. Price 6/-. (1935.)

Levellers in the seventeenth century whom Oliver Cromwell unflinchingly crushed.

Our present-day Christian communists do not feel, even if the Gospel of the Kingdom, as Jesus taught it, did not advocate economic and political revolution, that that is any sound reason why the Christian Church to-day should not preach communism. Jesus taught principles: He did not deliver precepts, and the implication and application of the principles of His teaching—especially that which concerns the love of our fellow-men and the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth—demand to-day the propagation and practice of communism.

It is to be noted here that by communism is meant, not any of the older forms of communism, especially those of the distributive kind, but modern collective communism, which demands the ownership by the State of all large-scale means of production, and the dictatorship of the proletariat, by which the material goods created are utilized primarily for the benefit of the proletariat. Of course communism involves much more than this. It promises equal education and culture for all, equal leisure and pleasure for all. It points mankind, if its policy be adopted, to a marvellous condition of health and happiness, freedom and enlightenment, progress and prosperity in a terrestrial paradise of perfect freedom so well described by John Addington Symonds:

'These things shall be! A loftier race
Than e'er the world hath known, shall rise
With flame of freedom in their souls
And light of science in their eyes.

Nation with nation, land with land,
Inarmed shall live as comrades free:
In every heart and brain shall throb
The pulse of one fraternity.

New arts shall bloom of loftier mould,
And mightier music thrill the skies,
And every life shall be a song,
When all the earth is paradise.'[2]

If there be no religion in such a communist community it will simply be because religion has nothing to contribute to its welfare. The communist is a very practical man and he only judges of things by the benefits which they contribute, and those mainly materialistic. It is good news to learn from some of these

[2] *Songs of Praise*, 312.

writers that the family (notwithstanding Plato) will remain in the communist State but relieved from the horrors of a Victorian or Fascist family life. Death also will remain, but it will be painless.

Of course the Christian will recognize that these visions of a terrestrial golden age are derived from the Bible, and he will feel that without the Christian religion in its purest and noblest form such a golden age cannot be realized. He will also feel that it is only by the conversion of every individual to God and by his remaining in a state of grace that the golden age can be sustained. This conversion he holds must be voluntary : secured by teaching, example and Divine inspiration. In short, all hope for the future welfare of mankind, including its material prosperity and progress, depends absolutely upon the Christian religion in its purest moral and spiritual form and on its power to purge the soul of man from covetousness, cruelty, pride, falsehood, envy, hatred, malice, injustice and lust. And the Christian hopes that he is not failing either in justice or charity if he doubts whether the Communist State with its utilitarian and materialistic ideals is able to deliver mankind from these evils — the main cause of man's misery.

> 'Of all the ills that human life attend
> How few that kings and laws can mend or end.'

THE DEMAND FOR THE EVOLUTIONARY POINT OF VIEW.

It is claimed that communism must be judged from the evolutionary standpoint. Communism must not be identified with any of those forms of communism which have so pitiably failed in the past. Even the best form of communism in the present is far from having attained the ideal. The communist motto : 'To each according to his needs, from each according to his powers,' is as yet very inadequately practised in Russia, where (it seems strangely archaic) the proletarian workers receive wages which depend upon the quantity and quality of the work done. The communist's claim, that communism should be judged by its ideals and potentialities rather than by its actual achievements to date, is undoubtedly sound, but what communists claim for themselves in this respect, they must be willing to concede to their opponents. What is sauce for the communist goose should also be sauce for the capitalist gander. Capitalism,

although this is not recognized by its communist critics, is as evolutionary as communism. It also has a future. Mussolini has declared that it is just at the beginning of its career. It is the fashion of communists to describe capitalism as decadent and outworn. In their cartoons, capitalism is represented by aged men with long beards, bald heads and portly figures in contrast with the youthful and athletic communist. But it is not quite certain whether capitalism may not be more youthful and more athletic than communism. It is certainly a much later product of economic and social evolution. If communism is not to be judged by its past failures, neither ought capitalism to be judged by its blunders and cruelties, its selfishness and ugliness. It has shown an enormous power of evolution; an amazing ability to adapt itself to new demands; to eliminate abuses; to improve methods; to humanize its ethics. If a glowing picture can be painted of the potentialities of communism, it ought to be recognized that a no less glowing picture could be painted of the potentialities of capitalism. Up to the present, the actual achievements of capitalism far surpass the achievements of communism as a benefactor of mankind. It ought therefore to be recognized that the idealist method of judging communism should in justice be used in judging capitalism. Capitalism itself is in a state of transition, and it would appear to be growing better as it grows older. All the sense of social justice is not, as these writers too readily assume, on the side of the communist. An intense lover of social justice, Ebenezer Elliott, the author of the favourite socialist hymn: When wilt thou save the people?[1] wrote a little poem on the communism of his day which was of the distributive kind:

> 'Who is a communist? One who has yearnings
> For an equal division of unequal earnings
> Bungler or loafer, or both, he is willing
> To put in his penny and pocket your shilling.'

G. K. Chesterton, the author of another socialist hymn: O God of earth and altar,[2] a line of which is cited in this volume, described the communist State as a 'prig and a bandit.' All the virtues are not on one side. Moreover, we do well to recognize that an economic or social system that may be good for one

[1] *Songs of Praise*, 314. [2] *Songs of Praise*, 308.

nation is not necessarily good for another. One of the weaknesses of the communist idealist is that he insists upon his communist system being forced upon all nations and peoples even at the point of the sword. It is this ugly appeal to armed forces, when it serves his purpose to use it, combined with his professions of humanitarianism, which have led plain men to charge communism with hypocrisy and cruelty.

What is cheering about the present situation, at least in Great Britain, is the steady improvements in our social conditions : improvements achieved, it is true, not without much opposition and some misrepresentation : improvements achieved not without blunders and not always with pure motives, but achieved nevertheless. Anyone who will read that little monograph : *A Basketful of Memories*, by Prof. Okey, himself an ardent socialist, will recognize that the condition of our English working classes has been enormously improved economically, educationally, politically and socially during the last seventy years : and this under an evolutionary capitalist system. It is this incontestable fact which will lead many Christian Englishmen to feel that a policy of persistent adjustment and improvement in social legislation and practice is the right method of advance, rather than that of revolution.

Mr. Hecker, in his essay in this volume, recognizes that we English are probably not going in the future any more than we have done in the past to copy Russian methods. He writes :

> 'The conflict of Christianity and Communism which, in the Soviet Union, will probably end by the destruction of organised Christianity, may, in a country like England, result in a more or less peaceful compromise. This is possible because of certain peculiarities of the British economic and social background into the description of which we cannot now enter. The English people, while always ready to taste a new wine, wherever it may have grown, somehow or other are managing to pour it into the old skins, which so far have proven remarkably tough and flexible to hold both the old and the new. The Abbey of St. Albans may be taken as a symbol of the syncretistic qualities of English thought and culture. There, at St. Albans, we have under the same roof a most amazing continuity of architectural style. Beginning with the crude old Saxon, it rapidly passes through the later Saxon, the Norman, the old Gothic, and terminates with the exquisite fine lines of the English Gothic.
>
> 'For obvious reasons the Russian character and tradition are different. Having had little or no property which he could call his own, the Russian is not afraid to destroy—he rather enjoys it. He often does it long before he has decided what he is going to put up in place

> of the demolished structure. When the huge Moscow Cathedral of the Saviour was pulled down to provide a building site for the Palace of the Soviets, there was hardly a word of protest on the part of anybody.' [3]

Bishop Westcott, one of our greatest Christian socialists, used to say: 'We ought to remember, but how easily we forget, that Russia is only in the fourteenth century.' Russia may have now leaped into the Millenium, but before we take the same leap we want to be quite sure that she has.

Evolutionary Christianity.

If capitalism and communism are to be judged, not by what they are, but by what they might be, the same kind of judgment should be extended to Christianity. Christianity is essentially evolutionary. It is not the religion of a legal code, nor of a book, but of the Spirit of Freedom, Truth and Love given supremely to mankind in and through Jesus Christ. Moreover its history shows that where alive, it has never been static. Although it possesses continuity of the most vital kind, it is a continuity which does not depend upon uniformity, either of institutions or formularies. What Christianity has done in the past is no measure of what it might achieve in the future. Whether in the future it will succeed in converting all communists into Christian believers, and transforming all capitalists into Christian philanthropists who possess and administer their wealth as God's stewards, cannot be foreseen. This will depend in no small measure upon whether the Christian Church will courageously refuse to be captured by the politicians or the economists and devote itself whole-heartedly to its primal duty of bringing the soul of man into right relations with God and the personalities of men into right relations with each other.

Communism and Socialism.

This volume would gain in clarity if socialism and communism were not, in nearly all cases, used in it as interchangeable terms. This false identification of socialism with communism only serves to confuse the issues. 'We are all socialists to-day,' said the late Lord Salisbury. Most responsible, good-hearted, patriotic British citizens are not only greatly interested in social questions but recognize, whatever their poli-

[3] Julius F. Hecker, *Christianity and Communism in the Light of the Russian Revolution*, p. 299.

tical party, the pressing need for social amelioration and social progress. They all earnestly desire social betterment, an alleviation of the hard conditions of life for our wage-earning classes, the elimination of uncertainty in employment, the raising of the standards of subsistence and comfort for our poorer citizens, the providing of State aid (supplemented where possible by personal contributions), sick allowances, out-of-employment allowances, old-age pensions, pensions for widows and orphans. They desire just wages for every class of work and view with sympathy the proper endeavour of the great labour unions to assist this end, provided those unions are not seduced into political revolutionary methods or anti-social action. They desire also the planning of production combined with competent and beneficial distribution. They recognize, however, the supreme difficulty of achieving all these things immediately, but the path of persistent and progressive experiment and endeavour will no doubt give us them all in the end. These people would have no objection to being described as socialists in this sense, yet they are very far from being communists either of the old distributive communist type or of the more modern — although rapidly becoming out-of-date — Marxian collectivist type. Catastrophic revolutionary communism they abhor, and it is the threat of it which is largely responsible for the creation of a tyrannical Fascism. The Christian religion is not tied, and ought not to be tied, either to communism or to Fascism.

Lord Charnwood and Lord Wolmer.

The *Sunday Times* of March 1st published the following criticism by Lord Charnwood, a member of the Modern Churchmen's Union, of Lord Wolmer's advocacy of the constitutional changes in the relation of Church and State proposed by the Archbishops' Commission.

> I am no such expert in ecclesiastical politics as the Bishop of Norwich and Lord Wolmer, but in the last days of the struggle over Prayer Book Revision I was honoured by an invitation from the *Sunday Times* to state the case for the Prayer Book Measure, agreeing as I did with Lord Wolmer in supporting it. Perhaps, therefore, you will let me now express the dismay which, I believe, the great majority of people who care for the Church of England would feel if that controversy were to be revived in an extended and embittered form.
>
> The importance and difficulty of the Church's ordinary work are evident, and it is scarcely less evident that year by year greater devo-

tion and greater wisdom are being given to that work, and that clergymen who hold divergent views on some matters are less unable than of old to understand other people's views and co-operate with them for an object which transcends their differences.

We should all lament the necessity, if it existed, of diverting a large part of the attention of Church people to the championship of one side or the other in the controversy now threatened, and regret, too, that exaggerated impression of our internal dissensions which must be given to the outside world. Is there any such necessity?

Lord Wolmer, if I understand him, is partly moved by dislike of the fact that, since the law governing the Church is largely obsolete, discipline cannot now be enforced through the ecclesiastical courts against the sort of earnest but wrong-headed clergyman who used to be prosecuted in those courts fifty or sixty years ago. It looks all wrong on paper, but in practice is that sort of discipline which could be enforced by prosecution in courts, however much reformed, a matter of primary importance to the spiritual life and power of the Church?

'Spiritual Liberty.'

Has the Church's work really become increasingly paralysed of late years because coercive authority has increasingly fallen into desuetude? If our bishops generally are prepared to declare that it has, most of us would bow to their experience. Until they do, most of us will think that the desire for uniformity and discipline, in which Lord Wolmer seems to resemble the late Sir William Harcourt, is a very misleading guide.

No doubt, however, both he and the Archbishops' Commission are chiefly influenced by an aspiration for 'spiritual liberty.' What liberty means in practice requires in every case some thought, since it must generally include the liberty of someone to coerce or overbear someone else, and bodies claiming to be called 'spiritual' are notoriously no exception to this. In this case the 'spiritual' body concerned is that competent and respected business organ of the Church of England, the Church Assembly, and the supposed oppression which has evoked this demand for liberty was the rejection by the House of Commons of the Prayer Book Measure.

As a worker in a small way for that Measure (having been a 'Teller' for it in the House of Lords) I, of course, thought the House of Commons mistaken in its judgment, but I never could see that it was acting wantonly or oppressively. I very soon discovered that most of the Church-going men and women of my own acquaintance were glad to be rid of the proposed new Prayer Book. One considerable section of Church people, of course, resented that new Prayer Book intensely; and there was a smaller minority opposed to it which was drawn from that very section of Church people whom it was expressly designed to placate.

As for the rest of the Church people outside the Assembly, a majority of them evidently acquiesced in it so far that they were unwilling to go against the Bishops, and the late Archbishop Davidson in particular; but it is probable that most of them disliked the Revised Prayer Book on the whole, and it is quite certain that they did not like it much. It is certain that they did not wish the controversy to be continued.

I would add that if there had been a deep and widespread feeling among Church-people in favour of the Measure, the House of Commons

could not have rejected it. Is it not absurd to suggest that the Church, if lay worshippers at large are included in that term, was harshly overborne, by a merely 'secular' authority with no moral right to interfere, in a matter in which the Church's 'will had been fully ascertained'?

Church Government.

The Church Assembly is indirectly elected through the Parochial Church Councils. Those councils consist of those good-natured people among our neighbours whom we can persuade to keep a watch over a number of small matters, such as repairing from time to time the spouting of the parish church. Through them we obtain the services of more distant neighbours, who are unknown even by name to most of us, but who must be even more good-natured, and who deal in the Assembly with more difficult but equally unexciting matters of business concerning the Church throughout the country. They do this work extraordinarily well as compared with any other large assembly.

When, at long intervals, there comes before them some issue of a kind more vital to the Church, they are sure to address themselves to it with as good judgment as most of us possess and with admirable temper; but it is none the less impossible to assume that they will reflect the mind of the Church as a whole with even that tolerable degree of fidelity with which the House of Commons reflects that of the nation. To obtain an Assembly of which this could be assumed we should have to introduce into our Church life something similar to our political system of elections, which can only function through the process of electioneering with which we are familiar in politics.

It is surely not ungodly on the part of the average Churchman that he would extremely dislike such a change in our Church life unless the need for it became far greater than it is. Yet until we have in this way secured a fully representative system of Church government, Parliament with its responsibility for the whole welfare of the nation, cannot be relieved of its duty to exercise in the last resort some control over the Church Assembly.

The Scottish Case.

It is quite true that in a technical and formal sense the Established, Presbyterian, Church of Scotland possesses (like the Church of Rome) a 'spiritual liberty' which the Church of England has never had. Do those of us who envy that Presbyterian Church hold up its professed doctrines and its form of worship as patterns for us to copy? Of course we do not, and this should lead us to inquire more closely whether this formal 'spiritual liberty' is necessarily a great advantage. Most English Churchmen have so far been content to do without it because it could only be had at too heavy a cost to the spiritual life of the Church —to use the word 'spiritual' here in its fullest and most natural sense.

That cost would have to be faced (and the stress of persecution might compensate it) if, as in Germany, the State were trying to force upon us principles contrary to our Church's fundamental faith. But it would be fantastic to suggest that this is a real danger, and timorous to doubt that, if ever it came near us, the Church of England, which is all this while growing 'in the unity of the spirit,' would be prepared to fight it and would win.

Lord Charnwood's apprehensions are shared to-day by so many Church folk that they deserve the most serious consideration by our Church authorities.

THE SOURCES OF THE SECOND GOSPEL*

By the Ven. Eric Rede Buckley, M.A., Archdeacon of Ipswich, author of *Introduction to the Synoptic Problem.*

'It seems then incontestable that the Second Gospel has been composed by the same processes as the first and third; a source in relation to these, it has sources itself.'

So wrote Loisy more than thirty years ago. English scholars, impressed by the apparently uniform style and vocabulary of the Second Gospel, have hesitated to accept this conclusion, but the opinion that *St. Mark* is composite has been slowly gaining ground. Uniformity of style makes it difficult to distinguish sources from one another with accuracy, but may be due to a redactor having set the impress of his own style on matter taken from different sources. If we had not St. Mark's Gospel we should never suspect that St. Luke was not the original author of the matter he borrowed from St. Mark. Accepting the view that *St. Mark* is composite, Dr. Cadoux has attempted to reconstruct the three sources from which he believes it to be drawn.

The first, which he calls *A*, was, he believes, a Palestinian document written about A.D. 40 in Aramaic and translated into Greek by the redactor of the Second Gospel; this source therefore exhibits the clearest traces of the redactor's own style. 'It shows more interest,' he says, 'in the significance of events than in the time or place of their occurrence. . . . *A* shows a distinctly balanced and articulated form.' It contains two series of five controversies, and before the first and after the second of these 'we find two blocks of narration which fall into seven scenes each,' and between the two series of controversies, three sections which fall into three scenes each.

B, which he calls the Gospel of the Dispersion, was written in Greek about 67 A.D., probably by John Mark. It takes an interest in miracles for their own sake, and 'faith, another chief

* By Arthur Temple Cadoux, D.D. (London). James Clarke & Co., Ltd. 6/- net.

interest of this source, is characteristically the faith that makes miracles possible.' Its style is more marked than that of the other two sources; it takes an interest in names, places and numbers, and is definitely pro-Jewish. Its form, like that of *A*, is symmetrical, as it contains five groups of five incidents.

C, the Gentile Gospel written in Greek about 50 A.D. In it Jewish terms are explained and Gentiles are shown in a favourable light. One of its chief interests is to prove that Jesus was not executed as an insurgent. All three sources were composed with a view to being easily learned by heart: and Dr. Cadoux thinks that *C* was the Gospel with which the redactor was first acquainted and that he knew it practically by heart.

The redactor used *A* as his basis throughout, occasionally varying the order of *B* to suit that of *A*, and of *C* to suit that of *A* and *B*. He did not use the whole of his sources, so there is one lacuna in *B* and several in *C*.

Such in brief outline is Dr. Cadoux' most attractive theory.

Now obviously it raises two questions: (1) Did St. Mark employ three sources? (2) Is the reconstruction of these sources convincing? In the chapter headed, 'Evidences of Three Sources,' nine supposed triplets are examined. Several of these are very impressive, *e.g.* iii, 21-35, where 21 and 31-35 may be attributed to one source, 22 and 28-30 to another, and the rest to a third; or the threefold prediction of the Passion, viii 31, ix 31, x 33 and 34; or ix 35 ('if any man would be first,' etc.) compared with x, 31 and 44. Two, however, are of doubtful validity; he points out that in xiv, 10 Judas is called *the one* of the twelve; in xiv, 43 *one* of the twelve; and in xiv, 20 is referred to as *one out of* the twelve, 'showing a habit of language different from that of the other two.' He does not, however, point out that the word 'out of' rests on the authority of *D* and the Old Latin, and is omitted by B. Aleph. C. L., which read *one* of the twelve as in xiv, 43. Again, he points out that Mary is called the mother of Joses in xv, 40 and the daughter of Joses in xv, 47, and adds in both these verses that the common Jewish name appears under the Greek form of 'Joses,' while in xv, 43-45 the same name has the form Joseph, 'again a difference hard to explain except on the assumption that this belongs to a third source.' But does this follow? The son (or father) of Mary,

being presumably a Galilaean, may always have been known as Joses, while Joseph of Arimathaea, being a Judaean, may always have been known as Joseph.

We have noted these two cases because Dr. Cadoux seems at times a little over-anxious to find evidence confirming his theories, but on the whole we think he has succeeded in showing that in certain passages three sources appear to have been combined. It does not, however, necessarily follow that all St. Mark's sources were continuous narratives or that in each place the three sources were the same; *e.g.* the three sources which seem to lie behind iii, 21-35, may or may not be the same as those from which the three predictions of the Passion are drawn. The cases examined in his second chapter prove a multiplicity of sources, but not quite necessarily three and three only. It is only if three sources covering practically the whole Gospel can be successfully reconstructed that we can confidently say—three and three only.

This brings us to the second point—is the reconstruction of the three sources convincing? Dr. Cadoux uses the argument from vocabulary and style only to support conclusions reached by other means. His positive criteria are the interests, outlook and consistency of the narrative, 'which criteria are comparatively free from the charge of subjectivity.' But we doubt whether these criteria are quite as reliable as the author thinks. The visit of the Magi and the command to preach to all nations might, as far as their interests and outlook go, seem more suitable to St. Luke than to St. Matthew, while the presentation of Christ in the Temple seems more in keeping with the interests and outlook of St. Matthew than of St. Luke.

We think that there are two things which suggest that the reconstructions are not wholly satisfactory.

(1) The healing of the deaf man (vii, 31-35) and of the blind man (viii, 22-26) are the only two miracles recorded in *St. Mark* in which Jesus used an external remedy in effecting a cure. These two cures are by this so sharply differentiated from all the other miracles of healing that it is very difficult to suppose that they do not come from the same source. Yet Dr. Cadoux attributes the former to *C* and the latter to *A*. The reason for attributing these two events to the same source is not merely

'similarity of phrase,' but a characteristic peculiar to these two healings.

(2) A distinctive feature of St. Mark's Gospel is the insertion here and there of Aramaic words, and it seems natural to suppose that these are either a characteristic of one of the sources or were inserted by the redactor himself. The word Rabbi occurs three times and Rabboni once, but is not explained; since in twelve other places the equivalent Greek word *didaskalos* is used, it seems not unreasonable to suppose either that this was the word the redactor habitually used himself, and that Rabbi is taken over from a source, or that the words may be characteristic of two different sources. Yet Rabbi appears in two of Dr. Cadoux' sources, *A* and *B*.

Of the other Aramaic words, *Abba* occurs in *A*; *Talitha Cumi*, *Eloi Eloi lama sabachthani* and *Golgotha* in *B*; *Ephphatha*, *Korban* and *Boanerges* in *C*. It is true, as Dr. Cadoux points out, that while *B* uses 'which is being interpreted' to introduce the explanatory Greek word, *C* uses 'which is'; but whether this difference is sufficient to outweigh the initial improbability of all three sources having contained Aramaic words is doubtful.

Let us now consider the support which the usage of words and phrases gives to Dr. Cadoux' theory. He shows that certain characteristics of St. Mark's style, the word *euthus*, *meta* with the genitive and the historic present, occur far more frequently in *A* and *B* than in *C*, and the same is true of certain Aramaisms which occur in this Gospel. Further, he makes a point of the fact that of the 204 words which occur only twice in the Gospel, 113 are peculiar to one or other of the three sources, though by arithmetical probability only 68 should be. All this is certainly impressive and demands very careful consideration.

Again, there is considerable force in the argument contained in the following passage:

> 'We have thus in *A* a series of passages in which the compiler uses his characteristic language with obviously greater freedom than in *B*, and with far greater freedom than in *C*. This accords precisely with the conclusion arrived at on other grounds . . . that he translated *A* from the Aramaic, that he copied *B* with the freedom of ancient literary method, but that *C* was the gospel on which his religion had been bred and which he would therefore have by heart.'

But some of the instances he adduces as confirmation from language do not appear satisfactory. Two of these we will consider.

(1) *Sabbath.* Dr. Cadoux says *C* never uses the word, *B* only the singular genitive absolute, *A* only the plural except in ii, 27*f*. If we turn to ii, 23-28, we find that five of the eleven occurrences of this word are in these verses, twice in the plural, three times in the singular. Here we notice that the plural is used in the narrative portion of the passage and the singular in the two sayings of Jesus introduced by the words 'and he said unto them.' It seems to us that if this proves anything as to the sources of the Gospel, it proves that ii, 23-26, came from one source and 27-28 from another.

(2) *Pisteuo.* Of this he says: 'No two sources use *pisteuo* in the same construction, nor *suzeteo*. *B* never uses *dialogizomai*.' We are therefore presumably to infer that difference of construction implies difference of source; but *B*, in which it occurs most frequently, does not always use it in the same construction, nor does it always use *suzeteo* in the same construction. *Dialogizomai* occurs most frequently in *A*, but there it is used in three different constructions, two of them actually occurring in consecutive verses. All this suggests that Dr. Cadoux is mistaken in thinking that because a word is used in a different construction, it indicates that it comes from a different source.

Dr. Cadoux with immense labour and patience has collected a good deal of evidence in favour of his theory, though not all of it appears on closer investigation as convincing as it does at first sight. But he does not consider evidence which tells against it. For instance, it has been suggested that the use of the expression 'the twelve' to denote the disciples was derived by St. Mark from one of his sources. It is used ten times, whereas the word 'disciples' is used about forty times: yet Dr. Cadoux finds it in all three of his sources. Again, he attributes x, 23 and 24 to the same source, though 23, 'How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God, and 24, 'How hard it is to enter into the kingdom of God,' look like a doublet, especially as verse 25, 'It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God,' connects far better with verse 23 than with verse 24.

Other instances might be given, but enough has been said to show why we are unable to accept Dr. Cadoux' theory that three continuous sources are combined in *St. Mark*, and his reconstruction of them. The book, however, should receive careful attention from all who are interested in the origin of the Synoptic Gospels, whether they are able to accept its conclusions or not. Dr. Cadoux has done his work with a thoroughness which enables his readers to test his conclusions for themselves, and if he has not found a final solution of the problem of the composition of *St. Mark*, he has given reasons for supposing that several sources have been used. The problem is so complex that with the material at our command a final solution is perhaps unattainable.

HOW HAS GOD SPOKEN?

REVELATION, what is its meaning? Is it purely supernatural, as the older theologians would have it? Only fifty years ago, Dr. Mozley, speaking of miracle as a necessary test of revelation, said: 'The visible supernatural is the appropriate witness to, and outward sign of, the invisible supernatural.'

Or is revelation purely a natural product of the human mind, as some of the moderns suggest? Mr. Julian Huxley in *Essays of a Biologist*, referring to the first apprehension, or rather earliest conception of Deity, says:

> 'Man projected the idea of that active agency he knew best—human personality—into his idea of cosmic powers.'

In other words, is revelation merely imagination?

There is a third view brought forward in Canon Wilson's *Revelation and Modern Knowledge*, which says that what we call revelation is simply discovery, that

> 'what has been taken for an act of God should rather be called an acquisition by man through the quickening of his spiritual faculty.'

In direct contrast with this view is that of Barth, who says that revelation 'is not the other side of discovery, but something wholly given, the authority of which is above reason.' I cannot resist a quotation from Dean Matthews' *Essays in Construction*:

> 'It is a curious illustration of the remoteness of English theology from that of Europe that Barth is welcomed as an ally by some Anglo-Catholics.'

L. S. Thornton in his essay on the 'Christian Conception of God' in *Essays Catholic and Critical* expresses a fourth view, which is, to use his own words,

> 'Nature, Man, History, the Incarnation . . . Revelation must spread over the whole of this field: the different stages of revelation are interconnected.'

Perhaps it would not be too much to say that this view represents the trend of the more orthodox of modern theology.

The purpose of this article is to throw light on the nature of the relations between the natural and the supernatural by discovering the essence of revelation, and the four views already expressed will give us sufficient to go on. The problem resolves itself into a discussion between natural and revealed religion, and the main point will be to decide whether they are truly distinct, or whether there is a real fusion between them. Huxley's opinion that revelation is really projection, and Wilson's that it is only discovery, will be abandoned as we go along, leaving us to decide between the older idea, which is shared by Barth, that it is entirely supernatural, and the modern position that revelation covers every aspect of knowledge of God.

Take the case of the supernaturalists first.

Can we say that true revelation is purely supernatural? Lonsdale Ragg in *Evidences of Christianity* points out that 'natural religion is inadequate; it creates a demand only.' Of which revealed religion is the supply.

> 'If God should reveal Himself to man by a higher and more direct method than that of natural theology, such a method must pass out beyond the physical realm of causes and effects. Something of this sort is implied in the very word supernatural.'

Antonio Aliotta in *Science, Religion and Reality* quotes Ritschl as holding with Schleiermacher that

> 'The faculty of knowledge which exists in man is limited to the understanding of the laws of matter, whilst religion deals with purely spiritual things. The sentiments of the human heart find their answer in the revelations of religious truth contained in the Bible.'

The view that revelation is essentially supernatural stresses the fact that important religious experience is not merely unsought, but that it is unobtainable by seeking. Preb. Phillips said 'It is as much out of our power to procure a revelation as

it is for a blind man to appreciate a sunset. The veil must be taken from our eyes.' The definition of revelation may thus be taken as 'The manifestation by God of some truth by a supernatural illumination of our minds, either directly, or mediately as through the prophets.'

Revelation, then, is supernatural in that it surpasses the essential qualities of human nature and its ordinary requirements, and also surpasses such co-operation by God as man requires to use his nature properly. We can argue, therefore, and so disprove Wilson's opinion, that revelation differs from discovery in that it is not due to man's effort. For example, when we fall in love, we have the revelation of the worth of a human personality which no amount of research or study could give us.

So, too, revelation differs from reason, for the truths given by revelation are such that could not be ascertained by reason. It differs, too, from inspiration. For example, St. John was inspired to write his Gospel, but it was not revealed to him. There is much confusion of thought caused by the revelation being identified with the record of the revelation. The Incarnate life of Christ is the revelation : the Gospels simply record that revelation. So, to deny the supernatural nature of the revelation is to deny the Divinity of Christ.

This seems to form such a conclusive case that one wonders at there being any problem at all, but it is well to remember that before it can be accepted several presuppositions must be accepted first. For example, that God is omnipotent and omniscient, that He is personal and loving, and therefore willing and able to reveal Himself to men who are willing and able to accept His revelation. It depends, too, on the acceptance of the definition, for there are many who use the word revelation loosely to mean little more than when it is used in current parlance — as in the phrase 'Police Court Revelations.' Again, there is the modern tendency to be chary of cut-and-dried, water-tight distinctions. Modern thought does not like a sharp, clear-cut differentiation between natural and supernatural.

In *The Christian Apprehension of God* by H. R. Mackintosh we see the fusion of the ideas that our knowledge of God is *revealed* both naturally and supernaturally — without that distinction which was made by Paley, Butler and their successors.

The following quotations make this fusion clear:

> 'The revealed fact is not man-made, nor poetically contrived; it is given, or presented, or found to be unmistakably there.'
>
> 'All religious knowledge of God, wherever existing, comes by revelation; otherwise we would be committed to the incredible position that men can know God without His willing to be known.'

—a view which is also expressed by A. B. Davidson in the words

> 'If men know God it is because He has made Himself known to them.'

Mackintosh, having shown that all knowledge of God is revealed, goes on to show that revelation is supernatural in that it is

> 'something which neither nature nor humanity, viewed in their normal aspect, can in the least explain: something, rather, which is due to the creative action of God.'

It would seem, therefore, that we must deny the differences, and assert that natural religion is in itself a revelation, seeing that the natural is created, and creation is supernatural.

At first glance, to refuse to differentiate between natural and supernatural, or revealed, religion seems to deny the supernatural altogether, and to reduce Christianity to the revelation of a primitive *mana* worship; but this is not so. It is ennobling rather than degrading to see the action of God, the supernatural, in every aspect of life rather than to see Him only in the narrow confines of Judaism.

True, we are told that it is no more unfair to make the Jews the organ of religious sight for all mankind than it is to make the eyes the organ of sight for the whole body, but it is an argument which does not satisfy. In point of fact, a revelation in Palestine was of no help to the natives of Africa, any more than my great-grandfather's brain is any good to me. One might go further, and say that just as it would be unfair to give the father the brains of the whole family, so it would be unfair to deny to countless generations of innumerable other races the possibilities accorded to the Jews of knowing God.

We cannot hold that God would deliberately withhold Himself from human souls who were seeking Him. Comparative religion, which is now a recognized science, tells of the universal search for God in all tribes at all times in all places. To insist on the essential difference between revealed and natural religion is to insist that God has put up a barrier, saying to the majority of man, 'Beyond this you cannot pass.'

Surely it is better to believe that all signs and tokens of God's presence, wherever and however manifested by the paths of both natural and supernatural religion, are God-given. 'The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handiwork.' Can we agree that the distinction between revealed and natural religion is one of degree and not one of kind, that the so-called natural merges into the so-called supernatural?

Remembering that there are very real differences of degree, we can say with A. E. J. Rawlinson that 'Christianity claims to be a religion of revelation, and as such proclaims to mankind an authoritative Gospel in the name of the Living God.' When Charles Gore says,

> 'What I think is amazing is how little the modern intellectual world, which claims to be, and appears to be, seeking God with all seriousness, how little it faces the question of the reality of positive Divine revelation,'

he is speaking for us all, but the modern intellectual world will not be helped in its search if rigid barriers of 'this is natural' and 'this is supernatural' are placed in its path. Far better to say, 'God reveals Himself in countless different ways; through your microscope as through the prophets—if you are honest seekers after truth.'

The older rigidity was needed, and served its purpose against the antagonists of Christianity who denied along the paths of the inadequate theistic theories of theism, pantheism and deism, or along the antitheistic lines of atheism, agnosticism and materialism. But in these days, when the best of the non-Christian thinkers are progressing constructively rather than destructively along the lines of psychology, philosophy and biology, new methods are called for. As Beibitz puts it so well in *Rationalism and Orthodoxy To-day*:

> 'The true method of defence in the case of Christian theology is absorption. The Logos doctrine is the true philosophy of science.'

He argues elsewhere that the origin of religion cannot be found in the theory of Huxley, 'Man has projected himself into the universe and found himself therein,' but that the origin of religion is rather to be found in man having reacted in a certain way to certain aspects of the universe. 'Is it true to say,' he asks, 'that religion is an instance, in a higher sphere than the physical, of adaptation?' And, as Matthews does in *God in*

Christian Thought and Experience, he goes on to show that religion will appear as a biological factor, and this consideration yields a biological justification for belief in God — it even sets it higher than the sphere of justification, for according to no theory do we justify a new limb or increasing mental power.

And so it appears that there is no contradiction between the biological view of religion and the view which bases religion on revelation. A true theism will not set Nature in opposition to God, neither will it identify them, and if man be a religious animal, as he undoubtedly is, then the whole environment must contain, or rather be made up of, such a spiritual character that will explain man's reaction and response. Christian theism regards the whole environment of men as alive with spiritual life.

Each advance towards God, throughout history, is a revelation from the theological, and a response or reaction from the biological view-point. There can be no conflict between the two. Revelation is supernatural—that is to say, more than natural—in that it is God's disclosure of Himself to man; and revelation is natural in that it is the response of man to his environment—to the spiritual world around him. This, then, is the conclusion which emerges from this paper:

> 'Revelation is both natural and supernatural: it is supernatural in that it is the disclosure by God of Himself, and it is natural in that it is man's response to his spiritual environment.'

The implication of this is quite simple, that all life is strictly speaking supernatural, and the paradox of faith is that response to the supernatural is in man the natural outcome of his being made in the image of God.

Nowhere does the New Testament deny the all-pervading presence of the supernatural, but always leads us to believe that in Christ we live and move and have our being, and our knowledge of Him who is the Father of all mankind. In conclusion we may quote from the article on 'Nature, Natural Phenomena,' in Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*. 'We notice the complete absence, in His view of the world, of any such distinction as has been drawn between the natural and the supernatural.'

J. Hope Urwin.

CHRISTOLOGY IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

By the Editor.

THE *Oxford Dictionary* defines Christology as 'That part of theology which relates to Christ, a doctrine or theory concerning Christ.' The range of the theme is enormous, and only a cursory treatment is possible. If our Christology differs to-day from the Christology of a century ago, and it does in some important respects, it is due to the influence of the following significant facts:

(1) The theory of Emergent Evolution as the best way of conceiving of the Divine creative method has replaced the static conception of the Universe and the irruptive creative method of traditional theology.

(2) Criticism of the Gospels has revealed the inadequate character of the historical evidence for the Virgin Birth and has in consequence led to its being transferred from the sphere of objective history to religious myth.

(3) New Testament Criticism would seem to indicate that our Lord's consciousness and activity were subject to human limitations and that these human limitations must be of necessity the correlatives of a true incarnation.

Whether these limitations are best explained, as Gore taught, by a doctrine of Kenosis (the voluntary deprivation of Himself of the attributes of Deity by the Second Person of the Trinity as a condition of His becoming incarnate) will depend upon some further considerations which will emerge in this paper.

It is clear that the old traditional beliefs in the omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence of Jesus Christ during the period of His earthly life, cannot be maintained in the face of modern criticism of the Gospels.

(4) Theological study has made clear, as Armitage Robinson pointed out in an Open Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1903, that belief in the Virgin Birth is not necessary for belief in the Incarnation, nor has the Virgin Birth been expressly

declared by any Synod of Bishops to be a cardinal doctrine of the Christian faith. In this connection it is of interest to observe that the Creed of the Council of Nicaea, whilst setting forth expressly the Doctrine of the Incarnation in its most orthodox form, yet nowhere mentions the Virgin Birth. This fact has left it open to Christian theologians to investigate, if the Virgin Birth be abandoned, by what methods we may and ought to think of the Incarnation being accomplished.

Such investigations will not I believe demand the surrender of, nor departure from, the essential positions achieved by Christian orthodoxy in the long period of theological research and controversy which assumed clearly defined issues at the Council of Nicaea (325) and culminated with the Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.). Before Nicaea the Church's Christology had fluctuated between two extremes: (*a*) Adoptionist Monarchianism, which thought of Jesus as a man of men but endowed with the Holy Spirit more perfectly than any other human being, His ministry being characterized by a complete surrender to the influence of that Spirit; and (*b*) Modal Monarchianism which conceived of the Divine Being unveiling Himself in three successive stages in His work of Creation, Redemption and Sanctification, first as Father, secondly as Son and thirdly as Holy Spirit.

The early heretical Christologies represented by different forms of Docetic Gnosticism possessed no doctrine of a real Incarnation, and the same may be said of the later Arian and semi-Arian Christologies. Docetic Gnosticism rendered Incarnation impossible because it possessed no doctrine of the true manhood of Jesus Christ; while Arianism rendered Incarnation impossible because of the inadequacy of its doctrine of Godhead as enshrined in the Person of our Lord.

The great theological achievement of Nicaea (325 A.D.) was that it affirmed the divine nature in Jesus to be *essentially* divine —derived deity, it is true, but of the same nature as the divine Father from whom it was derived. The great achievement of Constantinople (381 A.D.) was that it asserted the true manhood of Jesus Christ. This true manhood, united to true Godhead, had been most inadequately represented by Apollinarius as a vital animal nature not possessed of a rational and moral consciousness (*nous*). It was the task of the Councils of Ephesus

(381) and Chalcedon (451) to convict and condemn various false ways of thinking of the relationship of perfect Godhead to perfect manhood in Jesus Christ. That union of the two natures must not be thought of as a commixture resulting in a third nature neither entirely divine nor entirely human: nor must it be thought of as a parallel mechanical conjunction of the two natures divine and human. The right view of the union is that it is hypostatic — a union which might be compared with that of thought and will in the same personality. In Jesus Christ we must learn to see the Divine in and through the human and the human in and through the Divine. These two natures thus personally or hypostatically united were unchangeably united and permanently united. It is as accepting these conclusions and as standing on this basis that the modern theologian undertakes to investigate the mode of the Incarnation in the light of modern research.

And here it ought to be noted that a study of the New Testament seems to indicate that it possesses several Christologies and that these, except in the essential truth that God is in Christ, are not entirely consistent with each other. The Virgin Birth Christology of *Mt.* and *Lk.* does not seem to be consistent with the Pneumatic Christology of *Mk.* and the sources of *Acts* i—xii. St. Paul possessed a Christology in no way dependent upon the Virgin Birth, of which he appears to have known nothing. The determining feature in St. Paul's Christology would seem to be the pre-existent Son of Man of Apocalyptic literature. If the writer of the Fourth Gospel knew of the story of the Virgin Birth, it is clear that he attached no importance to it for the purposes of his own Logos Christology.

The difficulty in producing any convincing theory of the method of Incarnation is that we really know so little of the mode of the divine existence, although much of the essence of the divine nature in its moral content. Secondly, we know so little of the origin of human personality; yet what is true of the origin of human personality is of great importance for the formulating of any credible theory of the mode of Divine Incarnation. We know that in Christian theology there have been three theories of the origin of human personality. (1) *Pre-existence* — that the personality of each human being existed in a previous state of being. This was the view of Origen and

some of his distinguished pupils, but it has never been widely held in the Church, although a great number of notable Christian men who had had no connection with Hinduism have held it. Wordsworth's *Ode to Immortality* presupposes it:

> The soul that rises with us our life's star
> Hath had elsewhere its setting and cometh from afar
> Not in entire forgetfulness
> And not in utter nakedness
> But trailing clouds of glory do we come
> From God who is our home.

And so sane an individual as Sir Walter Scott actually believed that he possessed recollection of a former existence — as presumably did Plato if he shared in his own doctrine of *anamnesis*.

(2). *Traducianism* — the belief that human beings derive their souls or personalities, just as they do their bodies, from their parents — the view that Adam the protoplast, the first human being, whatever we call him, possessed in himself all the souls of the human race potentially.

This belief has been widely held in the Western Church and has seemed to derive substantial proof from biological evolution. Indeed it appears to be as acceptable to Catholic theologians of the Augustinian type as it is to modern scientists, although presumably they wear their rue with a difference.

(3) *Creationism* — the belief that each human soul is a special product of a distinct creative act of God. This belief postulates a definite and direct personal relation between each soul and its divine Creator. It has been generally held by the Greek Fathers.

I cannot but think that our modern view of Jesus Christ compels us to believe that what is true of human beings generally must be true of Him, but in a higher degree. That indeed is an important way in which modern Christology differs from the traditional Christology. The traditional Christology holds that Jesus Christ differs in kind from other human beings, whereas modern Christology believes that Jesus Christ differs from His fellow-men, not in kind, but in degree. The author of *The Epistle to the Hebrews* writes:

> 'He that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified are all out of One. Wherefore He (the Sanctifier) is not ashamed to call them (the sanctified) brethren.'

If this presupposition be accepted, He must have come into existence by the same mode as other human beings. Which then

of the three modes described will be the mode of His Incarnation? I used to think that it could only be by *one* of these three modes, because it seemed to me that each excluded the other two, but I have come to think, difficult as it may be to present this conviction cogently, that all three modes ought to be regarded as co-operating to the process of the Incarnation.

Every human being pre-exists in the form of the divine *Logos*. This does not mean that we pre-exist as human personalities but that that which becomes our human personality, its essential substance, does pre-exist. We all realize that it is heretical to teach in the case of Jesus Christ that His human personality pre-existed. What pre-existed in His case was the divine *Logos*, which became incarnated, and it is this divine *Logos* which pre-exists in our own case. Sir Thomas Browne in his *Religio Medici* wrote of himself:

> 'There is surely a piece of divinity in us; something that was before the elements, and owes no homage unto the sun. Nature tells me I am the image of God, as well as Scripture. He that understands not thus much hath not his introduction or first lesson, and is yet to begin the alphabet of man' (Pt. II, Sect. xi).

The Traducian mode of the Incarnation in the case of our Lord is plainly suggested by the genealogy of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke. That genealogy concludes with the words, 'Who was the son of Adam, who was the son of God.' Jesus is viewed as deriving a divine descent from the Creator through the long line of His human ancestry. And any open-minded study of the personality of Jesus (notwithstanding certain modern Teutonic aberrations) pronounces Him to be a Jew — the fine flower of Israelite prophetic religion, but not less divine on that account. This Traducian method of the Incarnation conflicts in no way with His Logos pre-existence. But what place is left for the Creationist method of the Incarnation? It is here that the special action of the *creator spiritus* co-operates. It would seem clear that it was on the occasion of His baptism that Jesus first became conscious of His Messianic sonship — 'Thou art my son the Beloved' — and as probably the true text of St. Luke adds, 'today have I begotten thee.' It was the outpouring and influx of the Holy Spirit which created this Messianic consciousness in Jesus and enabled Him to realize that which He really was. It was indeed this divine creative act which may be said to have completed the divine Incarnation in Jesus Christ. Canon

Raven has been charged with identifying Incarnation with Inspiration in the formulation of his theory of the Pneumatic mode of divine Incarnation in Jesus. We cannot agree that this charge is correct. But in our own Christology we regard the Pneumatic co-operation in awakening the consciousness of filial relationship to the Father-God as but one of three co-operating methods of Incarnation. It seems to us that a similar creative act of the divine Spirit is needful in the case of each human being if he is to realize his own sonship to God. Hence for him, as for Jesus Christ, the method of the divine Incarnation in him is threefold — Pre-existent, Traducianist, Creationist.

It has already been stressed that it is in degree, not in kind, that the divine sonship of Jesus is unique, and it is in this that it differs from and transcends the divine sonship of other human beings. But there is another point to be noted. Jesus is unique when viewed incarnationally, because He is and becomes in increasing degree the personality in human history in and through whom the process of incarnation is carried forward. St. Paul views the purpose of the creative process as the bringing into existence of the sons of God (*Roms.* viii). It is Jesus first in human history who attains this status and it is He who thus becomes, through His historic personality, Gospel, Spirit, and Church, a means by which many human beings are raised to the level and realization of sonship to God.

Having answered this question, it is important to point out a great difference between the old and the new way of thinking of the Incarnation. The old way thought of it as an isolated event, happening to a single individual once and only once in time.

The new way thinks of Incarnation as the higher part and later stage of the Creative Process by which the Divine Creator manifests His personal nature in ever-increasing degree in the products of His creation — that is in the form of rational, moral and spiritual personalities. This Divine activity is spoken of in the New Testament, and particularly in the Johannine writings, as 'begetting,' and those begotten are called sons of God or children of God. The supreme example of this divine begetting is seen in the case of Jesus Christ Himself. In Him the Word became flesh (*i.e.* according to the Hebrew idiom assumed

human nature) to a degree achieved on no other occasion.

It may be asked: What is the proof of such an affirmation? Is it manifested by miracles? Is it the fulfilment of prophecy? The ancient Church would have replied: Yes. To-day we find the proof for that affirmation in the impact made by the personality of Jesus on human history. And that impact is of a specific kind—it manifests the power of carrying on the incarnating process among mankind—so that in the end the whole human race, in and through Jesus Christ, become sons of God. Humanity is only in the earlier stages of that Incarnation process, but I have no doubt that in the long course of human history which lies ahead the Unique Son will be found to constitute the Head of a world-wide redeemed humanity of sons of God.

In Christian theology the doctrine of the Incarnation becomes central, for it stresses three essential relationships.

1. The relationship of God to Jesus Christ.
2. The relationship of God to the Creative process.
3. The relationship of God to man.

In Jesus Christ men behold the Divine Nature in its moral and spiritual content, subject to human limitations. In Jesus Christ they see unveiled, though infinite ages before the completion of that process, the purpose of the divine creation. God's relation to the Creative process is transcendental, originative, directive, immanental and incarnational. Were we to sum it up in one diagrammatic term it would be panentheistic—all creation in God but in varying degrees—the Incarnate Son being most in Him. In Jesus Christ man is shown to be potentially what in many cases He is not yet actually—the Son of God. Thus the doctrine of the Incarnation is as much prophetic as it is historic. It offers a working hypothesis for the study of human history—that noblest hypothesis by which, as Christians, we are prepared to stand or fall.

It was Professor Pringle-Pattison, no mean philosopher, who wrote:

> 'We are far too apt to limit and mechanize the great doctrine of the Incarnation, which forms the centre of the Christian faith. Whatever else it may seem, it means at least this—that in the conditions of the highest human life we have access, as nowhere else, to the inmost nature of the Divine. "God manifest in the flesh" is a more profound philosophical truth than the loftiest flight of speculation that outsoars all predicates and, for the greater glory of God, declares Him unknowable.'

CATHOLICISM WITH FREEDOM

By W. Norman Pittenger, The General Theological Seminary, New York City.

ST. Augustine somewhere speaks of the Catholic Church as an ocean in which elephants can swim and a pool where lambs may drink. That is a bold image, but it expresses the paradox of Catholicism, a religion which combines opposites. And this principle of 'both . . . and' rather than 'either . . . or' is especially characteristic of Anglican Catholicism.

Here a faith is offered to men which will nourish the philosopher and savant, and will bring comfort to the simplest believer in the Lord Jesus. The genius of Catholic Christianity is in this holding together of seemingly contradictory truths: awestruck adoration of the transcendent God, and tender love towards that same God in His incarnate and sacramental presence; profound metaphysical theology, and homely, childlike devotion; an austere moral code rooted in the utter holiness of God, and a willing recognition of man's earthbound nature; the wholly Other whose thoughts are not as our thoughts and whose ways are not as our ways, and the humanized Deity who tabernacles with us in the commonplaces of daily life.

The Anglican maintains another in this series of paradoxes, for he conceives of the Christian religion as both authoritative and supernatural, and yet free and capable of constant development. He refuses to choose between authority and freedom: boldly he seizes both horns of the dilemma. He insists upon a Catholicism which shall loyally hold the central and traditional doctrine, discipline and worship of the Church of God, but which shall also permit and expect men to be free to restate and expand that tradition as the need arises. The Anglican view of authority is liberal; it seeks no static lawgiver, no oracular voice, but a genuine *consensus fidelium*, freely given and freely received, a common agreement of saints, scholars and 'holy and humble men of heart.' Anglican Catholicism knows that we dare not deny the personal rights of the individual, but it urges that the individual can find his greatest liberty in a humble submission

to this broadly conceived authority, testing for himself the truths which it asserts and making the experiment which ends in an experience. For dogma, considered in this way, is only the generalized statement of the truths implicit in a persisting Christian life, a life now two thousand years old. *Lex orandi lex credendi.*

This involves a profound trust in man. It is a trust based on the Incarnation, as fact and as doctrine. If man's nature could be used by God in Christ to express His reality in its richness, human nature in itself as created and penetrated by God must be a good thing. Man's reason may be trusted; his freedom must be respected; and his discovery and study will lead to real, even if partial, truth. He is illumined by the Light which lighteneth every man; and his reason is the candle of the Lord.

That is why Anglicans can fearlessly undertake the task of reinterpretation of the truths of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Church and the Sacraments. The findings of modern science, Biblical criticism and the several other departments of enquiry are gladly pressed into service; they are welcomed as parts of God's continuing self-revelation to men along various avenues of human experience. If Christianity is true, it will be congruous with all of these.

Every insight into new truth, the apprehension of beauty and the submission to goodness, all of human life and activity, are capable of mediating God and enlarging our knowledge of Him. The same is true of the non-Christian religions. Indeed there is only one universal religion — man's quest for God, a quest incited and sustained by Him, and rewarded at every stage by some revelation of Himself until in Christ the two movements of God towards man and man towards God meet supremely in Him who is Son of God and Son of Man. The 'ethnic' religions are partial and inadequate, but none the less real, disclosures of Himself by the one eternal God, and in that sense they are reverently to be accepted as preparatory to the unique, supreme and sufficient self-manifestation in Christ and His Church.

The Word who was in the beginning with God, the Word who is God, the Word who became man amongst us in our blessed Lord and Saviour — this is the same Word who spake through the prophets and who in divers manners is operative in

every corner of this vast and many-levelled universe. Anglican Catholicism gladly acknowledges the cosmic sweep of the Christian revelation. It believes that our progressive discovery is not merely reconcilable somehow or other with God's self-disclosure. It claims that our discovery is the reverse side of that disclosure, and is complementary to the definitive embodiment of Himself given us by God in Jesus Christ.

In this way, all Anglicans are Modernists, since they know that we never really possess the old truths until we see them in their greater setting and make them our own in terms which we understand and which our fellows can grasp. But they are not *merely* Modernists. For Catholicism is deeply grounded in the supernatural; it is based upon historical revelation. The faith which is to be related to the modern world has come down through the past: it is historical, sacramental, other-worldly. Nor can it be comprehended in our little formulae; we apprehend it, but we never can exhaust it. Therefore, we must gladly allow for variety and difference in emphasis, interpretation and expression of the basic Christian gospel of God who in Christ reconciles men to Himself.

God reveals Himself in many ways, yet He always remains mysterious. He has lived in our midst, supremely and uniquely, as man and in man; He has shown us His very heart in One who was bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh. But He is unexhausted by this revelation and in some real sense must ever be 'the unknown God.' It is the conviction of Catholicism that the God whom we know in Christ is of the same stuff (or as theology puts it, 'substance') as the God whose glory fills sun and stars. But this incarnational fact also guarantees God's real difference from His world, His absolute existence and His complete reality. God is beforehand in all our seeking; His prior activity calls forth our little human response to His loving manward movement; He is in all things and above all things; and what He has given us in our Lord Jesus Christ is a special and sufficient knowledge of Himself, enough to illumine our path and guide us in the way of life, but not to reduce His own majesty or diminish His eternal being.

The faith of historic and Catholic Christianity stands sure. Let us set down this irreducible minimum of our religion: that

he universe is created and sustained by an adorable divine Reality whose nature is love and whom tremblingly we call our God and the Father of our spirits; that His cherishing care for us includes a self-giving to men, itself part of an eternal movement in which He freely gives Himself to His creation; that his self-giving is centred in the divine-human life of Jesus Christ, historic, crucified and risen; that Christ reigns at the heart of spiritual Reality and yet lives with men in His mystical body, the Church; that His revelation and the life which He has brought into the world are continually made available to strengthen men's weakness by His Holy Spirit through sacramental means of grace. This is the faith of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church.

Because it looks to this historic faith, Anglicanism builds its religion upon events and happenings which are preserved for us in Holy Scripture and made alive in the experience of the Church. It appeals to history knowing that God's primary revelation is there, in individual persons and in the broad sweep of historical development. It does not preach a religious philosophy, but a faith based on hard, sheer facts, on real things which once occurred and which have made and continue to make a difference in the world. Anglican Catholicism claims continuity with the earliest Christian fellowship as well as with the more recent forms of Christianity, for the process is a unity. It takes its stand upon the Bible as the record of the first Christian experience — the story of how this unique impact of God upon men took place. This is its check against false development, both of belief and of practice. The Bible is part, but is it a *vital* part, of a cumulative tradition. And as an historical religion, Christianity can never depart from that long line of development which traces back to the Jewish people and their prophets, to Jesus Christ and the events of His life, and to the experience of the first disciples.

The Anglican appeal, however, is not to the Bible alone, but to the Bible as interpreted in 'the formative period of Christian doctrine,' roughly in the first four General Councils. Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon are normative in the sense that they gave the direction in which Christian thought could move without running off into fruitless speculation or over-

emphasis upon single aspects of the whole truth. Their statements are not intended to preclude further investigation and thought. No oracular infallibility is attached to them. Their authority is simply that they laid down the line of advance which has historically verified itself, in the devotional life of the Church, as most fruitful and satisfactory in accounting for all the facts of the revelation of God in Christ. There must be readjustment and restatement. But that God is no solitary monad but social-personal being; that Jesus Christ is 'as divine as God and as human as any man'; that by His Cross He reconciles sinful men to God—these are among the truths fundamental and implicit in genuine Christian experience, and they are broadly established by the Four General Councils.

The Christian life, though primarily life in the spirit, is also served by the great Christian institutions. And it is in keeping with this sense of the corporate nature of religion that Anglicanism has maintained, as of great value and importance, the traditional three-fold ministry of the historic Church. Yet it has never denied that God's Spirit may operate in other ways, and it dare not 'unchurch' those who are without episcopal ordination. It contends, however, that the episcopate is the best method for governing the Christian Church, and, if that is so, the way most pleasing to God; and on this practical ground, it would commend the old Catholic polity.

Because it possesses the historic faith and worship of the Church, and owns the discipline which has come down through the ages, the Anglican Communion rightly claims to be Catholic. Because it attempts the statement of that faith, worship and life in language of to-day, and maintains the precious liberty of men as reasoning beings who freely accept a freely given authority, it rightly claims to be Modernist. Because it is filled with zeal for the preaching of the gospel and its application in every sphere of individual and social life, it rightly claims to be evangelical.

And it looks to the future. It envisages a Catholic Church which will be based on the central Christian heritage, firmly rooted in history, rich in sacramental worship, maintaining the institutional stress which has been the strength of Catholicism, and nourishing the fragrant holiness and warm personal piety

which keep religion alive in the heart. On the other hand, it sees a Catholic Church which will be open-minded towards all truth no matter where it may be known, which will find in its synthesis a place for the priceless revelation of Himself given by God through science, art, philosophy, the non-Christian traditions, and every other human experience. It recognizes that in the last resort Christianity has no more dangerous enemy than anything which would narrow or restrict it. Catholicism is a richly concrete fact, and its breadth is its great glory. When we think of the Catholic Church, we cannot but think with Father Tyrrell of Him whose arms were spread wide on the Cross, not for a few men and women, but for the whole of the *orbis terrarum*. Peasant and savant, wise and simple, there is room for each and all in the great family of God; and Anglican Catholicism, supernatural and free, can never forget that God has chosen the foolish things of this world to confound the wise, and that it is to the humble in heart that the deep truths of the Spirit are to be revealed.

IN MEMORIAM

ALFRED CALDECOTT

ALFRED CALDECOTT, who died on Feb. 8th at the age of 85, was a familiar figure to the last generation of Modern Churchmen. He was a frequent contributor to the discussions at the annual Conference and took a considerable part in the direction of the Society. He was well known for his writings on the philosophy of religion to a wide circle, both in this country and America. To one who, like the present writer, had been his pupil these public activities represent only a small part of what Alfred Caldecott was and did. He was a man of wide interests. The philosophical temperament did not in his case lead to an abstraction from the affairs of men. He gave much time to the promotion of various causes which aimed at social righteousness. For many years he was a keen worker for the suppression of the opium traffic, and took a never-failing interest in foreign missions. He was a member of the Christian Social Union and had strong leanings towards the Christian Socialism of F. D. Maurice, whose chair he occupied in King's College, London.

He was one of those who hoped for a peaceful settlement of Europe in the difficult years before the War, and did what he could to establish contacts with Christian leaders and philosophers in Germany. I remember meeting Professor Eucken at his table in 1913 and the conversation on the dangers to peace which took place there. Neither philosopher suspected how near was the catastrophe. Caldecott was never one who adopted the popular cry of the moment, and it was characterstic of him that he proposed offering some part of the British Empire to Germany in order to remove any legitimate ground for complaint. He mentioned half Australia. It needs not to be said that the proposal was not received with approval, and *Punch* suggested that, if the scheme were carried out, we should offer the *inside* half. To-day the proposal does not sound fantastic, and we can imagine that a day will come when the world will be divided up upon some rational principle.

The whole of Caldecott's career was connected with universities, though he had some experience as a parish priest in the country. Edinburgh, Cambridge and London were his universities, and each of them contributed to his thought. At Cambridge he fell under the influence of Sidgwick, for whom he always had a great admiration. His attitude to psychical research, which was one of benevolent interest, no doubt derived from that source.

His dominant concern was the philosophy of religion, and his published writings are mainly on that subject. His contribution was not that of a great constructive mind, but rather that of a singularly hospitable and sympathetic one. I remember that he once asked a group of senior undergraduates how they would describe his philosophy. I rashly replied, 'eclectic'; but I fear that the Professor expected 'synthetic.' I doubt whether he had ever reached a systematic view which could be called 'synthetic.' His writings were immensely learned and patient accounts of the most important views on the subject, and his 'Philosophy of Religion in England and America' was the result of the assimilation of a vast range of literature. He had great sympathy with the attempt to base theology on religious experience, and some of his most valuable essays are concerned with types of Christian piety. He even had the courage to read a paper to the Aristo-

telian Society on the conversion of Wesley's first preachers!

Caldecott's work as a teacher was marked by the same characteristics as his writing. He was the very opposite of the German type of professor, who marches from one conclusion to the next, having mapped out the subject and settled his opinions in advance. Many students found his lectures exasperating in that they indicated no views as true and acceptable, or at least as those which would be taken as such in the examination. In dealing with the great problems of philosophy he was wont to give an account of the opinions of important thinkers and to end with the words, 'Well, think it over and see what you can make of it.' If the purpose of lectures on philosophy is to encourage thought, his were admirable, for students who had come with the expectation of hearing the 'correct opinions' often found themselves engaged in forming opinions for themselves.

Perhaps his most useful work was done in connection with the Theological Faculty of the University of London in the foundation of which he took a prominent part. The little band of Anglican and Free Church scholars, which included Dr. Forsyth and Dr. Garvie, had to overcome much prejudice before the Faculty could be launched in a University which was traditionally suspicious of theology. The harmonious and fruitful career which the Faculty has enjoyed is due, in large measure, to the foresight and prudence of Dr. Caldecott and those who were associated with him. The demonstration that such a Faculty of Theology could be founded in a modern University has had its effect on the whole University life of the country.

At King's College Dr. Caldecott was called to occupy the office of Dean when Dr. Headlam resigned the post of Principal. It was a critical moment in the history of the College, because then for the first time the new constitution came into full force. It was one of those constitutions which look impossible on paper, for it set up two governing bodies and gave to the Principal and the Dean almost equal powers. The Theological Department of the College became, in effect, a separate entity while sharing the buildings and other amenities with the other faculties of the college. Everything depended on the personalities of the Principal and the Dean. That the constitution has worked without difficulty in practice is due in no small measure to the tradition

of cordial co-operation which was established by Dr. Caldecott and the late Dr. Ronald Burrows.

Alfred Caldecott was one of those men of great intellectual power and deep piety who occupy little place in the public eye and do not attain the position in the Church to which these abilities might be thought to entitle them. He did not desire prominence, for he was singularly devoid of ambition or self-seeking, but his friends often regretted that, on his retirement from academic work, no niche could be found for him but a remote country parish.

If I may speak as one who knew him well, I should say that his salient characteristic was a deep sense of duty. This sometimes made him appear vacillating in practical affairs to those who had policies which they wished to carry through, but this appearance was due to his sensitive conscientiousness which anxiously weighed every consideration in the desire for right and truth. Of his kindness to those in whom he thought he discerned some capacity for thought and some genuine interest in the subjects which engrossed his own mind many could speak — and no one with better reason than the writer of this small tribute.

W. R. Matthews.

BOOK REVIEWS

DEALING WITH THE CIRCUMSTANCES*

Whatever other inestimable benefits may follow from the taking of Holy Orders, common experience shows that that act at least bequeaths a definite world view-point, which subsequent circumstances confirm, and necessity not seldom turns into obsession. It is that of the world regarded as a background to the parish; a world, moreover, which in its essence is no longer a collection of continents, but a concentricity of parishes. Like a beehive, the pleasant rustic exterior of which seems to proclaim individuality, the great globe itself is found on closer inspection to be but a mass of parochial cells, some filled with sweetness and life, some empty and cold, but all of the most wonderful and most deadly uniformity.

The distortion for which this view-point makes is apparent to all; but since it is so common among us, we are better able to appreciate a curious parallel which is found in Miss Cameron's *Civilization and the Unemployed*. In it Unemployment is substituted for the parish, and its writ runs throughout civilization, which is the world background. To one

* *Civilization and the Unemployed.* By A. M. Cameron, M.A. (Student Christian Movement Press. 1934. 3/6.)

Preface to a Christian Sociology. By Canon Cyril E. Hudson, Diocesan Chaplain to the Bishop of St. Albans. (George Allen and Unwin Ltd. 1935. 4/6.)

who has worked so earnestly and so successfully among those who are no longer in regular work—and we would single out especially her fascinating chapters on 'The Lincoln Experiment'—unemployment comes to be not only a matter of Service Clubs and Social Centres, but a means whereby men may be organized and socialized, whereby humanity may find its true self, a purpose in life, and something to live for. Since, therefore, unemployment, like civilization, has come to stay, those who suffer from or enjoy it must be led to work out their own salvation, cultural and corporate. How this is to be done, and indeed is being done, is the theme of this delightful and readable book. No final solution of the Unemployment problem is attempted. Like theological students who run Unemployed Clubs, the author doubtless has her own theories as to its cure, but, like them also, she feels that her own part is to give tangible expression to an *interimsethik*, which expression, besides being honourable and disinterested in itself, has also the merits of psychological soundness and success in practice.

Canon Hudson writes with similar conviction in his *Preface to a Christian Sociology*. That his conviction is born both of contemplation and study, that readers will take strong exception to some or other of his various theses, are no arguments against this important and significant book. It is written by an enlightened Catholic theologian who points out on the one hand the unlimited material resources which could be ours while on the other he shows us a deliberately created and entirely artificial scarcity of the necessities of life, and the sapping of man's spiritual powers which must inevitably accompany such a policy.

He begins with an urgent plea for a recovery of the 'Prophetic Vocation of the Church,' quoting with approval from Newman, 'The Church was framed for the express purpose of interfering (or as irreligious men will say, meddling) with the world.' Later he adds:

> 'I seriously believe,' said Maurice, 'that Christianity is the only foundation of Socialism, and that a true Socialism is the necessary result of a true Christianity.'

Let 'insight into the nature and problems of society' be substituted for 'Socialism,' and we have here the key to the contemporary interest in 'Christian Sociology.'

So Canon Hudson tells us:

> 'This book is written from the point of view of a social philosophy based on the sanctions and implications not only of "the ethical injunctions of the Sermon on the Mount," but of the whole corpus of Catholic theology, and which believes the task of the Church to-day to be, not so much amelioration and reform, as insight, discernment, challenge and "prophecy."'

That the world of to-day disregards supernatural standards, sanctions and judgments is a natural outcome of that religious outlook which substituted Self for the Catholic Church at the Reformation. The origin of the present ills in material life may therefore be found there also. 'The real influence of Luther on the mentality of the modern world lies in the extension of his essential anthropocentricism to the economic sphere.' The present condition of the home of Lutheranism shows how a Church has helped to create that against which she is completely impotent, the totalitarian state.

'It is not without significance, then, that the recent struggles of

the Church in Germany has seemed to many observers to have been waged on behalf of ecclesiastical independence considered, so to say, as an end in itself rather than as a necessary means towards enabling her to fulfil a part in the solution of the country's social and political problems.'

In these long and carefully planned chapters—The Charter of the Church: Social Objectives True and False: Our Present Discontents—Canon Hudson builds up his Christian Sociology, with an abundance of authors and references, tabulated in a manner at once scholarly and business-like. Readers will not necessarily agree with his pictures of the Church Catholic, actual and potential, nor will they discover that he fully substantiates the anti-social charges which he brings against non-Catholic Christianity. They will find that some matters on which the author feels strongly, *e.g.* the indissolubility of marriage, have received treatment out of all proportion to their relevance for these pages. But no one could feel quite at ease after having read this masterly exposition of present-day social injustice and political and economic chicanery, which is sanctioned, at least by a cold acquiescence, if not by active participation. Nor will anyone question the assertion that economic and social stability will never be achieved until all dealings of man with man receive a spiritual valuation.

'Civilization stands arraigned on the charge of making life even more and more difficult, for individuals and communities, at a time when man's increased control over the forces of Nature is pointing the way to making it less difficult. The unrelated and conflicting objectives of a society which worships Mammon create stumbling-blocks, not merely to Christian but to humane living.'

What must be done is clear, and since the barbarians are clamouring at the gate it is for the Church quickly to don her prophetic mantle and lead the sortie.

The final chapter of the book, 'The Spiritual Resources of Secularism,' is a little satyr-play, with the folly of modern Humanists, Lippmann, Jung, and Julian Huxley, as its subject. It is here, probably, that the author is most vulnerable. That his own is the last word on life none of these gentlemen would claim, but he may at least hope that he has some little contribution to make to a solution and definition. It is in such company as this, therefore, that the Christian Humanist or Modernist may, by his kindly tolerance, show himself to be a greater man than the rigorous exponent of the Church Catholic. For though it is true as Archbishop Temple, in a beautiful word-picture, recently pointed out, that there is a watershed which divides the streams of orthodoxy from those of heterodoxy, we must remember, too, another fact, which His Grace omitted to add; it is that the living waters of both again meet and mingle in the bosom of the same Mother Ocean.

J. R. Bateman.

BEDE AND HIS AGE*

The Bishop of Durham deserves the cordial thanks of all students of English church history for the inspiration which caused him to conceive that the twelfth centenary of the death of Bede 'warranted something more

* *Bede, His Life, Times, and Writings.* Essays in commemoration of the twelfth centenary of his death. Edited by A. Hamilton Thompson. With an Introduction by the Bishop of Durham. (Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1935. 15/-.)

considerable and more lasting than services in the churches and historical pageants in the parishes,' and for the expression of his resolve in the present volume. Too often pilgrimages to cathedrals and other sacred places of English church history achieve little more than the agglomeration of a multitude, whereof the greater part are uncertain for what express purpose they are gathered together. The Bishop of Durham's resolution, seconded by the editorial labours of Professor Hamilton Thompson, has produced a series of essays of pleasing variety, of sound learning, and of abiding value and profit to all who wish to remember Bede with the understanding. Dr. Henson's introduction is not only a testimony to the origin of the book, but a sapient prologue to its general theme.

Professor Hamilton Thompson too has been fortunate in enlisting the services of a number of scholars, nearly all of whom can speak with special authority on the subject of their essay. He himself has contributed out of the fulness of his knowledge of medieval monastic life in England a survey of Northumbrian monasticism, which it would be superfluous to praise. He has lived so long in the north-eastern region of England and has steeped himself so thoroughly in its historical traditions that his essay reads almost like a contemporary description of monastic organisation and life in the age of Bede. Readers who desire an approach to the epoch before studying the life of Bede himself would do well to begin with this essay.

They might continue with profit to that of Dr. Watson on 'The Age of Bede.' The present writer owes too much to the massive and oecumenical learning of a former teacher to venture to offer him the praise of a tyro. But it is not improper to offer a tribute of gratitude for an essay equally characterized by the width of its erudition and by the pungency of many of its phrases. It is difficult to resist the temptation to quote; but the essay itself is so compact that the temptation must be resisted save within strict limits. But two examples of ripeness of judgment upon men and movements must be given.

> 'Human thought had been steadily deteriorating for many generations. The elder Pliny belonged to a lower order of mind than Aristotle, and from Pliny downwards thought grew feebler and feebler' (p. 45).

> 'Gregory the Great, for instance, was influential because he was the average man of his age, taken at its best' (p. 49).

Passing from these general essays to Bede himself, Professor Whiting presents a careful and detailed account of the exterior events and facts of his life. Professor Wilhelm Levison of Bonn contributed what is perhaps the most outstanding feature of the volume by his treatment of Bede as historian. He points out Bede's approach to history through the paths of chronology and hagiography, though in both spheres he displayed criticism and independence of judgment in relation to his sources. Dr. Levison indicates the sources of Bede's Ecclesiastical History, and emphasises the great debt which all later historians of England owe to his writings.

> 'Most of what was known in the Middle Ages of early English history depended on his principal work, on the Continent nearly all of it' (p. 149).

Dr. Levison's chapter is authoritative and of great value from all standpoints. Notwithstanding, it is doubtful, as Professor Claude Jenkins points out, whether to Bede himself and his contemporaries the *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* was to be regarded as his most important contribution to knowledge. His primary interest was in Biblical studies and

exposition; and Dr. Jenkins's chapter is devoted to Bede as exegete and theologian. It is written with that combination of erudition and humour which is characteristic of its author; and it reveals a wide variety of quaint information, presented in a persuasive and attractive form.

Dr. Watson observes that in the age of Bede 'credulity was beyond measure,' and especially 'among monks and their admirers it was a point of honour to be credulous' (p. 45). The reader turns with interest therefore to Mr. B. Colgrave's chapter on 'Bede's Miracle Stories,' which must be read in detail in order to be appreciated fully. It contains an interesting analysis of the multitude of miracles which characterize Bede's chronicles. And if the writer is bound to conclude that 'Bede the hagiographer was only a little in advance of his times,' he brings him into relation with our own times by his own admission of 'a substantial basis of fact embedded in the stories' (p. 299). The concluding essays deal with the 'Manuscripts of Bede' by the Provost of Eton, and the 'Library of Bede' by Professor Laistner of Cornell, the latter of which particularly, though its theme precludes an easy and popular presentation, is of the utmost value for the thoroughness of its survey and breadth of treatment. The briefest essay of the book is that of Sir Charles Peers on Monkwearmouth and Jarrow, which supplies a valuable supplementary survey to that of the Editor.

The reader can only conclude his survey by a reiteration of thanks to the Bishop of Durham and Professor Hamilton Thompson for the suggestion and production of so valuable a volume. All students of English church history must be grateful for it; and it is to be desired that when commemorations of landmarks in English ecclesiastical development, whether of persons or movements, are made they should take the form of this commemoration of the twelfth centenary of Bede, and issue in the production of a historical volume written by scholars with erudition and impartiality, and of a character to be remembered with gratitude and pride.

N. Sykes.

A PILGRIM'S PROGRESS*

Mr. Geoffrey Allen has last autumn resigned his Fellowship of Lincoln College, Oxford, for the task of training ordinands in South China under the Church Missionary Society. Before going abroad, he completed a new book which takes us another stage on his pilgrimage. It will be remembered that Mr. Allen was once an eager disciple of a somewhat intellectual modernism but came under the influence of the transcendent theology of Karl Barth. At this stage, with Mr. Roy McKay, he wrote *Tell John*. Coming into association with the Groups, Mr. Allen experienced a conversion not without strong emotional accompaniments. He shared this experience with us in *He That Cometh*, which we had the honour of reviewing here three years ago. *He That Cometh* was hailed by some as the best statement of the convictions and methods of the Groups, but we then suggested it might be 'unfair to the Groups and Mr. Allen to identify them too closely.' In his preface to his new book, *Christ the Victorious*, Mr. Allen says:—

> 'I am grateful to those who work under the name of the Group. I have already written in an earlier book of the many lessons I have learnt in their midst. Since that time I have learnt through my own experience some of the dangers which attend spiritual conversion and subsequent reconstruction. I have therefore ventured to write this new book, with lessons which I had previously neglected' (p. 7).

* *Christ the Victorious*. G. F. Allen, M.A. (Maclehose. 1935. Price 5/-.)

The contrast between the previous book and this one is in some respects ery marked. In his earlier book Mr. Allen came for us with a sword, sharp convict us of sin: now he woos us with gentle words. In his opening apter on 'Forgiveness' he makes one of his charmingly frank con-ssions:

> 'I used to think it was rather noble to convict other people of sin, and to see the timid and weak shrink from the militant and strong. Gradually I am learning my mistake. I am learning to see that there is such a thing as spiritual bullying' (p. 17).

ven more arresting is his revised view on the subject of guidance. We ntured previously to complain that while exalting the intuitional con-ience he had given us no tests of its deliverances. Mr. Allen now writes:

> 'Clearly also however there are grave dangers of abuse in the doctrine and practice of intuitional guidance. Self-deception is very easy. A vain belief in one's own infallibility lies not far away. If the saints of God are utterly sure from time to time that God has spoken, so also and far more frequently are the deluded and insane' (p. 135).

nd yet again there is less here of the exaltation of the religious fellowship nd more of its dangers. He warns us against the idolatry of parties and hurches.

> 'Their members forget that it is they who constitute the fellowship; that they themselves are ignorant and fallible; and that the fellowship which they constitute is therefore also of necessity ignorant and fallible. With presumptuous pride they identify the name of God with the fellowship which exists to listen to God' (p. 77).

In these and other ways there is a welcome change of emphasis. We en go further and say that Mr. Allen has expressed with a passion, a vidness and a clarity all his own, some of those considerations which ve kept others from so close an association with the Groups. At the me time we do not mean this book is written as a criticism of the Groups; is not; rather Mr. Allen refers to the Groups with gratitude and we can ell believe that just as he has never gone back on that vision of the anscendence of God which Karl Barth showed him, so Mr. Allen will ver go back on what he has learnt in the Groups of the reality of religious llowship. Perhaps the most valuable aspect of this new book is the light throws on the nature of all religious fellowship and on the subtle dangers hich beset it. Mr. Allen has come strongly to hope that our broken eligious fellowships may be replaced by a true reunited Church, but he elieves a prerequisite of reunion is for us to grow into 'our own indepen-ent loyalty to Christ.' This is a hard saying to those in a hurry for results nd to those who love authority, but we believe Mr. Allen's re-assertion f conscience is timely in view of recent tendencies in Church and State. e writes:

> 'The Church does not exist to make a claim for absolute loyalty but to listen to such a claim. It is not without reason that its members are baptised, not into the Church but "into Christ"' (p. 76).
>
> 'The individual is not answerable to man for his faith in God. He is answerable to God for his conduct toward man. He must not delegate his sense of personal responsibility to other men. Rather he must widen his range of responsibility, and accept a vicarious individual responsibility before God for other men' (p. 203).

his emphasis on conscience he aptly supports with a quotation from Karl dam, the notable Roman Catholic theologian who wrote, 'Even though

the judgment of a man's conscience be objectively false and even though it be not in its genesis ethically irreproachable, yet he is bound to follow conscience and conscience alone.'

The opening chapter of *Christ the Victorious* is certainly the best. It is a very fresh and moving vision of the Mercy and Forgiveness of God. The writer speaks of that forgiveness as 'utterly and radically transcendent,' as 'a word which enters our hearts to work there with revolutionary power,' and of forgiving love as 'the law of all human relationships.' The next twelve chapters discuss a variety of subjects, all, as the writer justly claims, 'related to the living issues in the present world,' and all illuminated by his vision of the Mercy Seat. That on 'Salvation' is perhaps the least penetrating, while that on 'The Two Commandments' may be the most stimulating. Others have the titles, 'The Fall,' 'Liberty,' 'Fellowship,' 'Responsibility.' The subjects are numerous, ranging from communism to creeds, but the writer has something to say and it is usually worth saying. It is not a book to read straight through, but one to be taken chapter by chapter with meditation. Its candour and sincerity, its charity and humility make their own appeal and cast a softening light on our harsh problems. Its peculiar quality is a certain sensitiveness to personality. The book ends with a charming parable of the soul and God, written in poetic prose possibly reminiscent of *Hiawatha*.

Of course no one can range discursively over so many themes without disappointing or even irritating his readers. The questions raised and dismissed are often of great complication and difficulty and seriousness. We are not, for example, much helped by being told that birth-control involves psychological, physical, sociological, and religious questions. We all know this. It would have been of interest and value to have known where Mr. Allen stands and what chief reasons move him to stand there. Although he well says that 'to pray is love; to love is to live; to live is to hear and decide and act,' there is in places a certain lack of decisiveness in thought and of crispness in style. He does not choose to come down into the dusty arena of controversy where issues are fought out. He is also a little reluctant to climb the steep ascents of thought. His vision of God's Love and Forgiveness and Mercy is a beautiful and moving one. But vision without the backbone of thought fades 'like the memory of a guest who tarrieth but a night.' The forgiveness of God is a wonderful belief but some readers to-day will be haunted by another belief brutally expressed for them in the famous words of Omar, 'O Thou who didst with pitfall and with gin beset the path I was to wander in. . . .' Mr. Allen seems to have forgotten 'the acids of modernity' and does not trouble to provide an alkali. But we need not appeal to any pagan poet or modern mood, for in the New Testament itself there is another vision besides that of the Mercy of God, there is the vision of the Wrath of God, the Wrath, even, of the Lamb. The world of daily experience provides too many examples of a certain mercilessness for us to be able to forget this contrary vision, and if Mr. Allen would have men share his vision of the ultimate mercy, he must share with them their fears and doubts which experience creates, and himself pass through that fire. To put the point more detachedly a religious truth such as forgiveness cannot be convincingly applied to so wide a range of grave questions unless it is given an appropriate theological basis and definition. Mr. Allen, who was once a theologian seeking a religion, has become a prophet needing a theology. His danger lies in shutting himself up too quickly in a particular mode of thought and a particular emotional state; and now he has firmly realised his religious centre it should be possible to broaden his

eological interests and his emotional sympathies. Indeed this is a process ready very marked in the contrast between *He That Cometh* and *Christ e Victorious*. We only plead for what has already begun to be continued. or are we, though we voice these criticisms, the less gratified for his ntribution to religion in our day, and specially for his timely emphasis on anscendence and fellowship. For better or for worse Mr. Allen has chosen reveal to the world his spiritual pilgrimage, not as some do discreetly wards its end, but with great courage in its course. Inevitably it is not ly his visions and convictions but also the course of his pilgrimage which comes a matter of interest to many. We are grateful indeed for this ird glimpse at his journey. And as we look towards China and wish him od luck in the name of the Lord, we still hope to share his treasures.

HAROLD MULLINER.

FORM CRITICISM AND ITS USE*

There is now a considerable body of literature available for the English ader on what has come to be known as Form Criticism. B. S. Easton's *e Gospel before the Gospels* appeared in 1928. Dr. Vincent Taylor in s *Formation of the Gospel Tradition* gave outline and criticism of the ews of the chief exponents of the school in Germany, where indeed the ethod is no longer peculiar to a school but is generally accepted. Professor oguel's book, *The Life of Jesus,* translated some four years ago, con- ined a sound and balanced estimate of the method and its results. Prof. rant, who translates the book under review, dealt with the especially his- ical side of the subject in his *Growth of the Gospels*. Professor Light- ot, in his Bampton Lectures for last year, both outlines Form Criticism, ainly as developed by Dibelius, and contributes greatly to the investiga- n, particularly in his treatment of the Second Gospel. All these books ve been noticed in these pages in the last three years. There may be ded to the list Dibelius' *From Tradition to Gospel,* and his recently trans- ted *Form-criticism and Christology*. The book under review is a transla- n by Professor Grant of two short and brilliant essays, one by Rudolf ultmann, the other by Karl Kundsin.

Bultmann's essay, as the translator points out, is a popular exposition his exhaustive *History of the Synoptic Tradition.* Judged only as an hievement in condensation and clear statement, this little essay is asterly. In sixty small pages of print the whole theory is stated and mply illustrated. Source-criticism has established the Priority of Mark and e Q-document hypothesis. It has also put forward certain conjectures, nd, among others, it is significant that Bultmann mentions with apprecia- n Dr. Streeter's Four Source hypothesis. Of the dates of the Gospels ultmann will not speak with certainty, but he takes what must now be lled the conservative position, much as it may be found in Dr. Streeter's ork. Source-criticism exposes certain grave contradictions within the ospels ; for instance, between the teaching for Jews and that for Gentiles, between the eschatological and ethical teaching. It also raises difficulties, nakes them explicit, concerning the Messianic consciousness in Jesus, or out the real reasons for His condemnation and crucifixion. To resolve d solve, as far as ever may be, the student must proceed beyond Source- iticism to an analysis of the documents which that method has dis- ntangled. We must resist the temptation to pick and choose according to

* *Form Criticism. A New Method of New Testament Research.* By Rudolf Bult- ann and Karl Kundsin. Translated with a Preface by F. C. Grant. (Willett Clark nd Co. 1934. Price $2.00.)

taste from the Gospels in order to secure a consistent interpretation. The 'Either—Or' of Schweitzer or anyone else is illegitimate.

> 'It is certainly not sufficient to pass judgment in each individual case upon the authenticity of a saying or narrative of Jesus in accordance with one's own impressions; instead, one must endeavour to judge in accordance with a systematic investigation of the strata or strands of tradition the Gospels contain.'

The documents which the Source Critics discover to us have passed through editorial redaction of a doctrinal kind. This is plain to the Source Critic as for the handling of *Mark* by the First and Third Evangelists. Wrede and Wellhausen have maintained it to be true also for *Mark*, a thesis explored in this country by Professor Lightfoot. It would appear to have been true also for the Q-document: this was not merely a collection of Sayings, but an edited collection, a proposition reasonable enough on the face of it, and for which there is considerable evidence. In proceeding behind the sources,

> 'the first step is to distinguish between the traditional material which the evangelists used and their editorial additions' (p. 25).

A second consideration takes us further still, and is that peculiar to Form Criticism. The traditions which the Evangelists have collected and edited were originally short fragments or units, self-sufficient, of sayings or narrative. Further, these oral units were possessed of certain distinguishable *forms*. The oral tradition took its forms within the teaching, preaching and worshipping Christian community. This opens up three approaches to the Gospels as they now appear. Can we detect laws of growth in the traditions of communities in general, and may we apply such laws in some measure to the Gospels? Can we classify the forms preserved in the Gospels and, if so, can we thus discriminate between earlier and later material? And how far can we gather from our Gospels the history and perplexities of the early communities and then, facing about, in the light of that history determine how the various fragments making up the gospels came to be as they are?

Bultmann is here chiefly concerned to classify, and although the main heads are now widely known, it is worth while to re-state his own classification. He singles out first the Miracle Story:

> 'A comparison makes it clear that the miracle stories of the gospels possess a remarkable resemblance to the Hellenistic miracle narratives; the latter accordingly throw a significant light upon the problem of their origin or at least of their formulation.'

Sayings handed down 'in association with a little scene' he names Apothegms (the Paradigms of Dibelius):

> '. . . in their structure they are closely related to the narratives of Greek literature . . . It is characteristic that the narrated scene serves only as the framework for an important saying; the whole point lies in the saying . . .'

A healing on the Sabbath, or a walk through the cornfields, concludes with such a Saying. The setting is most often not historical. The Words of Jesus, Bultmann divides into Proverbs, Apocalyptic Sayings, and Sayings concerning the Law. The parables he finds to be rabbinical in type and, with Jülicher, declares they are not allegories.

> (They are) 'based upon everyday human affairs or relations, requiring an exercise of judgment on the part of the hearer, and urging him to apply this same judgment in the realm of the spiritual life, with which (they are) really concerned.'

Bultmann, one of the extremest of Form Critics, is here much occupied ith the authenticity of the tradition, a characteristic of the school as a hole often overlooked by its opponents. The real aim remains that of all ue historical criticism, to get as near as possible to the original tradition. ith this aim, the editorial wrappings are unwound from the Gospels; lowance is made for later influences. Two new criteria are available. So r as it is possible to abstract the types of the various 'forms' it is ssible also to point to distortion and addition as of later date. Of this itical instrument Dibelius has made much use. Secondly, for Bultmann, e historical value of the report of a Saying may in part be determined by e relation of the Saying to its setting:

> 'One must distinguish carefully between those apothegms in which the framework and the saying are so closely related that one cannot be told without the other — and others in which the framework and the saying are only loosely connected. Among the latter it is often only the saying of Jesus which is original and the frame has been supplied later . . .'

is conclusions are important:

> 'The investigation has shown that both the eschatological and the ethical teaching of Jesus belong equally to the oldest stratum of the tradition, so that one can hardly call either one of them secondary.
>
> 'On one point one must rest content: the *character* of Jesus, the vivid picture of His personality and His life cannot now be clearly made out; but, what is more important, the content of His message is or will be ever more clearly recognizable. Though one may admit the fact that for no single word of Jesus is it possible to produce positive evidence of its authenticity, still one may point to a whole series of words found in the oldest stratum of tradition which do give us a consistent representation of the historical message of Jesus.'

The second essay, by Karl Kundsin, is not concerned to state Form riticism, but with a highly interesting use of it. The endeavour is no less an to reconstruct the history of the early Communities from the Gospels s the Form Critics leave them, and without recourse to the Epistles or *cts*. Kundsin's historical method, as opposed to his critical, and its preuppositions, are not, indeed, peculiar to Form Criticism, but are rather development and a new use of the method of Strauss and of the Tübingen chool. Here, however, is nothing of the abused Thesis-Antithesis dogma.

Kundsin unfolds at the heart of the Gospels an inner Palestinian pearl. Here was a lowly brotherhood with the Risen Christ for Master, laying ore by the Fatherhood of God and love for the Brethren. We may learn o see the reflection of this first society in sections of the Gospels, and specially in *Mark* and *Matthew*. It is this community which names Jesus Son of Man' and, awaiting His return, thinks back its own apocalyptic opes into the mouth of Jesus Himself. It seems that for Kundsin the schatological teaching is not original to Jesus, though Jesus may have al ed Himself Son of Man; this, and the Jewish exclusive teaching of *Matthew*, are rather the earliest interpretations of His message. Moreover, Kundsin considers that the essence of universalism, in germinal orm, goes back through Phillip and Stephen and certain of the Palestinian roup to the teaching of Jesus. From this first 'Christianity,' itself outward-looking, there develops Hellenism, already present in *Mark* and anifest in *Luke*. The striking characteristic of Hellenistic Christianity as its possession by the Holy Spirit.

> 'It was primarily the Gentile-Christian community which was the community of the Holy Spirit.'

The passage concerning blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (Mt. xii, 32; Mk. iii, 29; Lk. xii, 10) thus marks the transition from the 'Son of Man dogma,' denial of which is forgivable, to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and the earliest form of the Saying is probably Mt. xii, 31.

The other development, not necessarily later, is ecclesiasticism. This is clearest in parts of *Matthew*, which Gospel also contains sections in keeping that accept the delay of the Parousia and stress the universal nature of the Message of Jesus. With both the Hellenistic and ecclesiastical developments there comes the exaltation of Peter as hero and leader. Yet that *Mark* may contain some genuine Petrine reminiscences is likely enough.

The reader will wish that both these essays had been fuller, but perhaps especially Kundsin's. Most suggestive is his bold advance from the recognition of strands within the Gospels, and particularly in *Matthew*, to a view of the life and belief of the communities responsible for those strands. The Gospel confines being broken down by Form Criticism, the diverse elements in the tradition are grouped according to the tendencies of the first communities. It is of secondary importance that, for instance, isolationism and universalism exist now cheek by jowl in the same Gospel. Instead of negative acceptance of the consequences of historical criticism, here, most refreshingly, is positive reconstruction of history in the light of the method. The reader will wonder perhaps if the presentation of *Matthew* is altogether consistent, or not a little arbitrary, and be at a loss to know, and at important junctures, if Kundsin ascribes a Saying to Jesus or the community. While if Kundsin appears more certain than Bultmann of the content of the teaching of Jesus, is it perhaps at the price of picking and choosing to some extent, and with a minishing of Bultmann's measure of objectivity?

Further study alone can answer these and a dozen such questions. Meantime to read through these two essays, looking up the New Testament references, would be a sound introduction to Form Criticism and an excellent revision of his Gospels for the parish clergyman. Perhaps more importantly, it proves an enthralling and exciting thing to do. M.T.D.

ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE OLD TESTAMENT*

Professor E. O. James's anthropological studies of myth, ritual, and sacrifice place him among those investigators who are developing new lines of research. It is interesting, therefore, to find him now turning his attention to the Old Testament. A series of public lectures delivered by him in 1934, as the first occupant of the Chair of the Philosophy and History of Religion in the University of Leeds, has now been published. These lectures deal with the Sources of Hebrew Tradition, the Hebrews before the Conquest of Palestine, the Hebrew Settlement in Palestine, Myth and Ritual of the Ancient East, the Religion of the Nomad Hebrews, Moses and Yahweh, the Religion of Israel before the Exile, and the Religion of Israel after the Exile.

The most interesting and informative of these lectures is that on the myth and ritual of the Ancient East. Professor James points out here that, apart from its own Aramaean ancestry, the two most powerful influences upon Palestine and the surrounding district were those of Egypt and Babylonia. Therefore it is to these great civilizations that we must turn first for a background of the religion of the Ancient East. In Egypt Osiris in various aspects is represented as,

'the lord and giver of life, typified in nature by the rising of the fertiliz-

* *The Old Testament in the Light of Anthropology.* By E. O. James, D.Litt., Ph.D., F.S.A. (S.P.C.K. 1935. 4/-.)

ing waters of the Nile and the consequent renewal of vegetation; and in the human order as the bestower of life beyond the grave.'

e complex ritual systems of the Ancient East revolve around the theme death and resurrection.

'The central feature is the importance of the king for the well-being of the community. Thus, both in Egypt and Babylonia the monarch is divine and plays the part of the God whom he embodies in the great seasonal festivals. In the Old Testament this conception is spiritualized and brought into relation with the Messianic Hope of a Golden Age to come when the rule of Yahweh is established over a restored Israel.'

ofessor James might have added that in Egyptian and Babylonian rature the conception is sometimes spiritualized in much the same way. yhow, even in a less spiritualized form the idea of a divine, life-giving gship, as Professor James notes in a subsequent lecture, survives in the i Testament.

'Traces remain in the solemn installation, revealing that the kings of Israel were actually regarded as sacred persons appointed as the human representatives of Yahweh very much as the reigning Pharaoh in Egypt was the embodiment of Re. Indeed, it was probably this divine character assumed by Hebrew monarchs that raised the opposition of the prophets, and possibly led the anti-monarchist school to transfer some of the incidents in the traditional history of Saul to Samuel.'

a modified form, it would seem, the divine kingship can be detected in theocratic system of Israel. In support of this view, Professor James ght might have quoted several passages from the Psalms. M. A. CANNEY.

A PLEA FOR VOLTAIRE*

This is a new volume in the Thinker's Library, published under the spices of the Rationalist Press Association. This history now contains over v volumes, well printed and bound, and wonderfully cheap. Among recent litions may be mentioned Professor Gilbert Murray's *Five Stages of eek Religion*, Sir J. G. Frazer's *Adonis*, and an admirable work by the esident of New College, Oxford (Dr. H. A. L. Fisher), entitled *Our New ligion* (a searching criticism of what is called 'Christian Science'). We lcome the latest addition of all — a selection from Voltaire, because it is sirable that people should clearly understand the great work he did in vocating tolerance and in combating superstition. He had many faults d shortcomings, but a disregard for what he believed to be truth was not e of them. That he was deeply and unreasonably prejudiced against ristianity is only too manifest; yet it is, perhaps, hardly to be wondered considering the state into which institutional religion had come in h eenth century France, and the *milieu* in which he had been educated. is little volume contains some of his most characteristic work, such as 'Questions of Zapeta,' 'The Sermon of the Fifty' and the 'Epistle to Romans.' The treatise on Toleration, which occupies about a quarter the volume, is rather a poor thing; and the poem on the Lisbon disaster laboured and, in some ways, ineffective. Perhaps no writer has ever used more hatred in Christendom than Voltaire; he has been stigmatized an Atheist, which he was not: he was a convinced Deist, and, unlike

* *Selected Works of Voltaire*. Translated by Joseph McCabe. (London. Watts and 1935. Price 1/-.)

d'Holbach, scorned Atheism. Mr. McCabe (formerly Father Antony, a Franciscan monk) has translated these selections in a very workmanlike manner, but one or two of his occasional footnotes are misleading, *e.g.* those on pp. 173, 174 and 175. We are quite aware that he would dispute this statement; but bias will out, even in such small matters as footnotes.

E. H. Blakeney.

THE RELEVANCE OF MODERNISM*

'Relevance' to-day is a key-word in the vocabulary of the prophets, and Mr. Richardson, adopting the prophetic rôle with much sanity and not a little courage, has written a small book which might well be called *The Relevance of Modernism.*

Here we are told by one of the younger generation of Modernists, what so many times we have heard from our non-Modernist critics, that we have no 'gospel,' no 'good news' for our post-War world. We are not exhorted to purchase tubs and to sally out to the street corners; our lack of 'gospel' is not in this. It is that we offer the bourgeois Jesus of Harnack and the Liberal Protestants to a world (it is our boast that we cater for those who think) which is sick of, and entirely opposed to, bourgeois ideals. This would not be so bad, indeed it might even be laudable, thinks Mr. Richardson, if the Liberal Protestant picture were authentic. We might strive and pray for the reconvertion of the younger men and women to the old ideals of the bourgeoisie. But the fact is, Mr. Richardson continues, that the Harnack-Herman reconstruction of history was shattered by Weiss and Schweitzer, while the debris has been swept away by Bultmann and Dibelius.

This charge is to some extent true. Many call themselves Modernists who can still rest in the stream of criticism upon the oars of thirty years ago. Certainly there can be no doubt that we have been awakened from our dream of 'the kindly business-man Christ.' Yet although it may be but a relic of bourgeois subjectivism, some of us still believe that even behind the paradigms, legends, and 'gnomes' we can catch if only a glimpse of a real person. Or is it that we are afraid of the consequences of believing otherwise and that Loisy has taken the right road after all?

Chapter III is probably the best of the book. Here Mr. Richardson not only attacks our Liberal-Protestant Theology; he also attacks us. We hear echoes of Karl Barth's thunders, now however sane enough. The challenge, too, of Frank Buchman is considered, but is put into its right place by a sentence which points out how much easier it is to 'share' our 'spiritual good things' than our 'worldly wealth and privileges.' The sting of this will be felt not by Groupers only. Whether we like it or not, this chapter will do us good. There can be no doubt that many of us to-day are sitting in our warm studies immersed in valuable study of the Pentateuch while outside, in the cold, living experiments are being conducted, the results of which are leaving us behind as 'museum curators.'

There is much in the book with which we shall disagree but most strongly with Mr. Richardson's reiterated objection to our 'optimistic view of man.' His objection is, or can amount to, a dangerous heresy. Unless the Gospels are destroyed altogether then it cannot be denied that their view of man is optimistic. Good news about God is good news about man. It is not true that the Hebrew is less optimistic of man than the Greek. This error has persisted for too long. Possibly the contrary is true.

* *The Redemption of Modernism.* By Alan Richardson. (Skeffington. 1935. 2/6.)

t. Paul was not typical of the Judaism of his day. We can easily under-and what Mr. Richardson means, as we do Augustine and his *superbia,* ut if it is hammered too hard we arrive at the point, as here, of speaking f 'the dead hand of Humanism,' without qualification. Fortunately Mr. ichardson is not consistent, since in Chapter IV he urges us to use our hurches for the purpose of religious education (he explains carefully what e means by this and it is a very good chapter). But this demands an ptimistic view of man; otherwise we do not teach, but preach Hell-fire.

It may well be too that Mr. Richardson is himself too optimistic about hat he calls Neo-Catholicism. An acceptance of the modern criticism of he Bible may imply no Modernism at all. For at least a few it means but he removal of one seat of judgment, leaving 'Tradition' more secure. Mr. ichardson seems not to have noticed that if Liberal-Protestantism reflects he bourgeois political Liberalism of the '90s so also does the retreat to the Middle Ages reveal that love of dictatorship which is one of the characteris-cs of our day, but which is rooted back in the period which produced the Oxford Movement.

This is a good little book and of salutary value. It is rather a pity that Mr. Richardson did not keep to what was apparently his first resolve, to emind us that Liberalism is no creed but an 'attitude to life' (Chapter I). fter the first chapter he seems to repudiate the very word and to pick out nstead the good things of 'Neo-Catholicism' and 'Neo-Evangelicalism,' nd to tell us that these are the genuine Modernism. True, they are; but wish he had rather exhorted us, 'These good things are the result of the iberalism which you are losing because of your "party" Modernism.'

J. R. C. Webb.

OLD TESTAMENT STUDY FOR BEGINNERS*

The English publishers of this book by an American author state on he wrapper that 'Clergymen, all teachers of religious knowledge, and tudents who are studying the Bible will find this book invaluable.' Clergymen should know all that is contained in this book, and more; and erious students will find it useful only as an introduction. It is most suit-ble for the layman with little time for further reading or for the busy unday School teacher who wishes to enlarge his general knowledge of the Old Testament books and the manner of their growth.

With this recommendation should go the warning that in one or two erhaps unimportant details the book is inaccurate: for example, the Fall f Nineveh is dated (p. 116 and elsewhere) 607 (the date accepted until the iscovery of the Babylonian tablet of the deeds of Nabopolassar, published y Gadd, 1923, which provides very strong evidence for the date 612 now enerally accepted), and Antiochus Epiphanes is referred to on page 177 as Persian king.

The discussion of the books of the Hexateuch is written in that good-empered and moderate strain which will best persuade the open-minded a man of the value of the critical approach, but it is difficult to resist the mpression that certain important points would not be grasped by a new-omer to this kind of study. A sample analysis of the sources of, say, the tory of the Flood, would help to make quite clear the facts that some of he sources belong to, say, the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. and that it s their final redaction which is of post-exilic date; the first of these facts night be easily overlooked by the not too careful reader.

* *The Modern Approach to the Old Testament.* By Jewett C. Townsend. (George Allen and Unwin Ltd. 1935. 5/-.)

The author's general discussions are the best parts of the book, and with the general subject of 'The Prophets and their Task' he deals as satisfactorily as his small scope allows. When describing individual prophets he is obviously hampered by the impossibility of mentioning everything even of the first importance; but it is disappointing to find no appreciation of, for example, the 'Servant Songs' in Deutero-Isaiah, or of the 'New Covenant' of Jeremiah. These defects are surprisingly not made good in the last chapter but one, 'Unfolding Conclusions,' where, in the section on 'The Idea of God,' the author's statement,

> 'I see the Bible not only as the record of God's progressive revelation of Himself to men but, coupled with that, of man's search for the living God. He who reads his Bible diligently and understandingly will be able to discern a progressive and developing idea of God . . . '

could have been persuasively illustrated by showing how the prophets contributed to this development, whereas they are in this section not so much as mentioned. Similarly, it would have increased the clarity and usefulness of the book if the author had in his short but otherwise satisfactory chapter on the Book of Daniel indicated the character of Apocalyptic (a branch of literature nowhere in this book discussed as such) as distinct from prophecy, and hinted at the enormous influence of the apocalyptic writings on the New Testament and subsequent Christian thought. Probably a desire to avoid technical terms caused this omission, but the *outlook* of apocalyptic writers should surely have been presented and explained. The limited claims of Daniel to be an historical book are brought out, but the real — that is, the apocalyptic — character of the most puzzling parts of it is nowhere suggested.

It is obviously impossible in a book of 239 pages to enter upon a discussion of every problem raised by a study of the Old Testament and the author's method in his general discussions and in his treatment of the historical books, where he is wisely content to show the character of the books and to bring out clearly from what point of view they were written, is highly successful. If less than justice is done to the prophets, this may be at least partly ascribed to lack of space, and if Mr. Townsend does not appreciate Hebrew poetry very deeply, or set what seems to us to be a reasonable relative value on the several books of the Poetic and Wisdom literature, this may be ascribed to the inevitable difference between personal tastes; and remembering that, as we are told in the preface, 'this book is written from the viewpoint of the pastor and Bible student rather than from that of the scholar,' we may commend it to that elusive person, the 'enquiring layman.'

A. R. C. Leaney.

HUMANISM AS THE 'COMMON FAITH'*

At first reading, the lectures of Professor Dewey are ambiguous. So learned a reviewer as Henry Nelson Wieman reported that Dr. Dewey had turned theist†, and was later to find that Dr. Dewey did not mean theism at all. In the end, all that is discovered to be a basis for a 'common faith' is a simple non-theistic humanism, in which values are to be sought for their own sake. In developing this thesis, there are several valuable distinctions which are made.

First of all, there is a distinction between *religion* and the *religious*. Religion as such is a group of beliefs (unsubstantiated except by the

* *A Common Faith*. By John Dewey. Terry Foundation Lectures at Yale. (Yale University Press. 1934.)

† cf. *Christian Century*, Nov. 14, Dec. 5, 1934.

questionable scrip of intuition) supposedly revealed by the one true God. Historic religions are relative to the social cultures in which they arose. Each religion has, therefore, varied in its concept of deity, worship, and morality. And all present religions are conceived in the light of ancient cosmology and society. Of course, if this is religion, we would agree with Dewey that it is outmoded, but it seems to the reviewer that Dewey is not discussing that vital sort of religion which is now present in society. He is throwing stones at windows which were broken some decades ago. On the other hand, the noun *religion*

> 'always signifies a special body of beliefs and practices having some kind of institutional organization, loose or tight, the adjective *religious* denotes nothing in the way of specifiable entity, either institutional or as a system of beliefs . . . It denotes attitudes that may be taken toward every object and every proposed end or ideal' (pp. 9-10).

With our allegiance to the *religious,* we must adopt the 'Logic of Modernism,' which 'demands that in imagination we wipe the slate clean and start afresh by asking what would be the idea of the unseen, of the manner of its control over us and the way in which reverence and obedience would be manifested, if whatever were basicly religious in experience had the opportunity to express itself free from all historic encumbrances' (p. 6). This, perhaps, is being too high-handed with tradition, but that such a purging of religious concepts is badly needed cannot be doubted.

Here is no denial of religious experience. It is maintained, however, that any experience may be religious, and there is no difference in kind. Furthermore, religious experience has no 'knowledge value.' One believes in God; one has experience of something; *ergo,* one has experienced God as conceived! Such reasoning requires no refutation.

> 'The actual religious quality in the experience described is the *effect* produced, the better adjustment in life and its conditions, not the manner and cause of its production' (p. 14). 'Any ideal pursued in behalf of an ideal end against obstacles and in spite of threats of personal loss because of conviction of its general and enduring value is religious' (p. 27).

One might ask what this passage means to a humanist. Is ramming one's head against a stone wall to be courageous in the service of ideals? Or is the universe friendly, although there is no theistic God?

If by friendly, one means that the universe has been a realm where emergence and growth, both physical and spiritual, have taken place, the verdict of history is at least partially 'yes.' Ideals have emerged.

> 'Aims, ideals, do not exist simply in "mind"; they exist in character, in personality, and action. . . . The aims and ideals that move us are generated in the imagination. But they are not made out of imaginary stuff. They are made out of the hard stuff of the world of physical and social experience. . . . The new vision does not arise out of nothing, but emerges through seeing, in terms of possibilities, that is, of imagination, old things in new relations serving a new end which the new end aids in creating. . . . The sense of new values that become ends to be realized arises first in dim and uncertain form. As the values are dwelt upon and carried forward in action they grow in definiteness and coherence. Interaction between aim and existent conditions improves and tests the ideal; and conditions are at the same time modified. . . . When the vital factors in this process are generally acknowledged in emotion, thought, and action, the process will be both accelerated and purified through elimination of that irrelevant

element that culminates in the supernatural. . . . There are forces in nature and society that generate and support the ideals. They are further unified by the action that gives them coherence and solidity. It is this *active* relation between ideal and actual to which I would give the name "God." I would not insist that the name *must* be given. . . . The *function* of such a working union of the ideal and actual seems to me to be identical with the force that has in fact been attached to the conception of God in all religions that have a spiritual content' (pp. 48-52).

This point of view is not atheistic. It is obviously not theistic, either, although some of the words in the last quotation remind one of Wieman's position. The religious attitude demands some sense of the connection of man and the universe, based upon selective choice of favourable factors. There is a power of good, or it may be powers. And they work 'within as well as without.'

Science, in the end, is the only way to truth, provided we accept that term in its wider and operational sense. This does not deny the actuality of mystical experience, but it allows science to examine it for what it is worth. It is science which has directly affected the life of present-day civilization; it is science which has indirectly destroyed the capacities of organized religion by setting up competing organizations which are more effective. On this point, Dr. Dewey may be partly correct, but it still remains a fact that approximately 90 per cent. of the criminals come from the 40 per cent. of non-religious homes in the United States.

The Catholic Church has emphasized the sacramental values of religion, and has not been bothered by science in so far as it does not interfere with sacraments and disciplines. The Protestants have been interested in the salvation of the individual, and have not been annoyed by social and moral changes outside a limited sphere. Of course, Dr. Dewey is blind to the newly awakened social consciousness of American Protestantism, which extends even to the Protestant Episcopal Church. Furthermore, when Dewey maintains that real changes in social affairs have not been made by the co-operation of religious institutions, but by the *humanizing forces of society*, he forgets the impact of religion upon social consciousness.

But Dr. Dewey gets into real trouble when he seeks a dynamic for his religious attitude. Humanistic religion rests upon intelligence, which is inadequate for social action unless a dynamic element leads to action. But 'there is such a thing as *passionate intelligence*,' says Dewey, 'as ardor in behalf of light shining into murky places of social existence, and as zeal for its refreshing and purifying effect' (p. 79). 'A clear and intense conception of a union of ideal ends with actual conditions is capable of arousing steady emotion' (p. 59). Even if one is swayed by these expressions of dynamic reason, the case is given away a few pages later: 'Were men and women actuated throughout the length and breadth of human relations with the faith and ardor that have at times marked historic religions, the consequences would be incalculable' (p. 82).

Finally, whatever God is, His actual unification takes place in the human imagination. God is really just a symbol of the general functions and trends towards value. And the only *conscious* power towards good is the human mind! And the only dynamic is *passionate intelligence!* This is, in the last analysis, a sorry substitute for the richness of the Christian tradition; and that it is unnecessary may be shown by examining the results of others who begin with presuppositions similar to Dewey's.

RANDOLPH C. MILLER.

Yale University.

GOD IS MY ADVENTURE*

In *God is My Adventure** Mr. Landau has made a contribution to the ychology of religion, and also to sociology, in the sense that the people scussed reflect changes which are going on in modern society, especially exhibited in the closer contact that there is between East and West. he book is a series of interviews and discussions with various living, or cently living, religious mystics or prophets who are claimed by Mr. ndau to be the persons 'who exercise the greatest influence in the modern orld' (p. viii). This statement will be a surprise to most of us.

Among the mystics and philosophers who are discussed are Count eyserling, Rudolf Steiner, Krishnamurti, Dr. Buchman, Pastor Jeffreys d Stefan George. The others are less well-known. Excellent photographs able one to see how far the theories of these leaders seem to be reflected their faces. In most cases Mr. Landau has interviewed the person he rites about, and in some instances there are two sets of interviews with gap of some years between, which illustrates the development of their ought. Keyserling's attitude to the Nazis is very vividly described.

Most of these men are off the track of organized Christianity. All of em are individualists, and if they cannot find exactly what they want in e form of religion in which they have been brought up, they are likely form new churches or groups of which they are at the head. Many of em are in line with Gnosticism, and the influence of Eastern mysticism is ain in a great number of cases. Many of the discoveries which they seem regard as so earth-shaking are in the Gospels, of which they seem hardly have heard, except of course Dr. Buchman and Mr. Jeffreys.

Mr. Landau is hard on the Groups. He could not get an interview with r Buchman in spite of repeated attempts. He finds in the Groups a lack intellectual thought and too much certainty that the Group way is the ly way. He thinks that there is in them a lack of reverence towards holy ings, and he does not like the hilarity and the little slogans. He gives n interesting and vivid description of his contacts with them, and he ad- its the obvious fact that they have succeeded in doing what organized ligion has all too often failed to do for the upper classes.

It is a strange reflection upon modern education that since 1919 the Four Square Gospel' of Pastor Jeffreys has opened up 200 churches in is country, with over 150 ministers and 17 missionaries. Fervent funda- entalism, emotional appeals, and the claim to heal the sick by faith alone an still work wonders. His narrative makes Modern Churchmen realize at their task is still to be done among great masses of their countrymen.

The book irritates one because it seems to assume that the Churches re doing nothing that is of much use. They are quite suitable for the lain men, but not for the better educated or really spiritual. But all that ese 'great leaders' have to say is said already, and the real work which involves is being done while these mystics revel in their visions. One i ses the Hebrew ethical emphasis, and the austere activity of the mystics f the Middle Ages. One feels also that they are all most individual- tic, and do not see that in the face of the modern movements against ligion a strong sense of the solidarity of religious men is of the first portance. Most of the cults here described appeal to the people who are t going to touch the social situation but who want to cultivate their ligious emotions. There is not much place for the mind, and there is too uch stress upon the eternal at the expense of time and history. There is vermuch of the sense of God as a mystic reality into whom we become sorbed as a drop in the ocean, not enough of the sense of God as Ruler

* *God is My Adventure.* By Rom Landau. (Ivor Nicholson and Watson. 1935. 10/6.)

and Judge with work for us to do. If this is the mysticism the Barthians dislike, many of us will agree with them. There is too much 'I' and not enough 'God.' The book is worth reading, if only as a warning, and it is well written and in many ways very interesting. MARCUS KNIGHT.

ABOUT PEOPLE*

In this small book Dr. Gray deals with one of the biggest problems of the practical Christian life, the problem of people in distress, and how to bring them to a realisation of the peace and health of God's Kingdom. When he writes:

> 'It remains for me one of the deep mysteries of life that God should seem so hidden from many souls who yet need Him and that they should suffer so for want of Him,'

he is voicing the perplexity of all who are passionately concerned with the moral and spiritual sufferings of humanity. His book is full of wisdom and common sense, and recognition of the right kind of sympathy as a primary essential: constructive sympathy that has grown from 'seeing life steadily and seeing it whole' and helps the individual to self-victory through courage and a full acceptance of himself, not the facile sympathy that merely commiserates with the sufferer.

Dr. Gray writes sanely and convincingly of spiritual and emotional difficulties, of problems of sex, of marriage, of adjustment to life at various stages, and although he touches but lightly on modern psychology he freely admits its value, and affirms that innumerable maladjustments in adult life are due to the domination of parents, who

> 'plead in the name of love. But true love does not want to dominate. It wants to see the object of affection rising to his or her best.'

Two of the chapters (xvi and xvii) are of especial value to those, say, newly ordained men, still inexperienced in dealing with people and their difficulties.

DALLAS KENMARE.

* *About People.* By A. Herbert Gray, D.D. (Student Christian Movement Press. 1935. 3/6.)

CORRESPONDENCE

SIR,

SUICIDE AND EUTHANASIA.

The teaching of the article in your February issue, pp. 633 *f.*, falls far below the finer pagan ethic. Suffice it here to quote the striking passage (Aeneid, Bk. vi, lines 434-9) in which Virgil brands the cowardly recklessness of all suicides and depicts their final and wretched state.

Perhaps, however, the robust conscience of Shakespeare most clearly reveals the inherent levity and impiety of such propaganda. Hamlet, not unmindful of the Divine Canon against self-slaughter, experiences an all but overpowering temptation to suicide, yet masters it with the unforgettable line of warning:

> 'To sleep—perchance to dream—aye there's the rub.'

Could the recklessness that is ready to transfer not only its own destiny but that of others to

> 'The undiscovered country from whose bourn
> No traveller returns'

be more adequately exposed and chastened?

E. L. JENNINGS.

Hon. Canon of Gloucester, some time R.D. of Cheltenham.

5 Wellington Square,
Cheltenham.

THE

Modern Churchman

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE
to maintain the cause of truth,
freedom and comprehensiveness
in the Church of England

INDEX—VOL. XXV

APRIL, 1935—MARCH, 1936

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of some change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

Editor: H. D A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.
Assistant Editor: M. T. DUNLOP, M.A.
Publisher: BASIL BLACKWELL, Oxford

INDEX I. CONTRIBUTORS.

	PAGE
ZANT, J. S.	... 370
HOP OF EDMUNDSBURY & IPSWICH	... 453
HOP OF BIRMINGHAM	... 614
QUET, A. C.	... 421
S-SMITH, J. S.	... 7
MLEY, J. A.	... 82
WNE, W. M.	... 70
KLEY, E. R.	... 664
NEY, M. A.	... 78
LLENGER, C. G.	... 465
SHOLM, A.	... 574
YTON, J. F.	182, 332, 639
LEMAN, A. M.	... 566
LTON, C. G.	360, 512
ED, J. M.	320, 550
SS, L. B.	236, 439
MMINS, E. A.	... 136
ATE, A.	... 27
RMER, P.	... 506
VEY, G. F. H.	... 34
KES-JACKSON, F. J.	... 607
MES, G. H. D.	... 205

	PAGE
HANDLEY, H.	... 145
HARVEY, G. L. H.	... 14
HITCHCOCK, A. E. N.	... 190
KINGDON, H. P.	... 559
MACFIE, J. M.	90, 198
MAJOR, H. D. A. M.	1-6, 57-63, 63, 113, 115, 169, 177, 281, 484, 541-550, 597-606, 628, 653-661, 675
MATTHEWS, W. R.	290, 687
NESBITT, R. C.	... 404
PERCIVAL, A. S.	... 23
PITTENGER, W. N.	... 682
POYNTER, J. W.	127, 618
RATCLIFF, E. C.	... 386
RICHARDSON, R. D.	... 301
SHEPPARD, H. R. L.	... 119
SYKES, N.	344, 490
URWIN, J. H.	... 669
WHITE, D.	... 475
WIGLEY, T.	... 220
WOOD, T. J.	... 214

INDEX II. CORRESPONDENCE.

(A) *CONTRIBUTORS.*

	PAGE
DERSON, C. W.	... 538
WN, A.	... 111
MPION, C. T.	... 279
ARKE, C. L.	... 162
AYTON, J. F.	... 275
LEMAN, A. M.	... 56
OPER, T.	105, 166
RNWALL, V. C.	... 55
OFTON, H. F.	... 168
LLAS, H. A.	274, 540
HERS, F. V.	273, 594
TCHER, A. W.	... 109
YD, A.	... 109
ANT, A. V.	... 106
NDLEY, H.	... 537
RDWICK, J. C.	... 107
GHFIELD, E. M.	... 107
UGH, N. S.	... 591
N, E. J.	105, 275
NINGS, E. L.	... 708
NMARE, D.	... 168
GGE, H. N.	... 164
LNER, G.	54, 165
CELEWRIGHT, F. H. A.	... 276
NTER, R. A.	... 270
WLAND-SMITH, J. N.	... 274
DAKER, W. H.	... 536
PPLEWELL, O.	... 272
CHARDSON, R. D.	... 537
YDS, T. F.	... 272
VIDGE, J. F.	... 652
DONS, V. D.	... 55

	PAGE
SCOTT, F. N.	... 652
THOMAS, C. G.	... 595
THOMPSON, C. M.	... 280
TREMENHEERE, G. H.	... 163
TUNSTALL, J. E. E.	... 278
VINE, R. C.	... 159
WALKER, H. F.	... 158
WILLIAMS, J. W.	... 159
WOOD, T. J.	56, 594, 596
WRENICK, B.	... 594
YERBURGH, W. H. B.	... 161
YOUNGHUSBAND, O.	... 162

(B) *SUBJECTS.*

Archbishop of York and the Way of Recovery	... 158
Anger of God, The	... 652
Baptism, Modern Teaching on ...	... 594
Care of Churches, The	... 536
Clergy as Socialist Propagandists	... 594
Conference at Jordans	... 56
Dilemma, The Christians ...	105, 270-275
Exodus, The Date of the	55, 111, 165
Fasting Communion	... 163
First Things First in a Mining Village	164
Gospel Criticism	... 279
Intellectuals in Retreat	... 55
Lampe's Tunes	... 55
Layman's Modernist Message ...	... 159
Marriage and the Church ...	... 591

	PAGE
M.C. Council Election, 1936	596
My Puzzle 105,	166, 280
Mother's Union and a Curate	109
Oxford Groups, The 107,	159, 161
Parson in Revolt, A 162, 276,	278, 537, 538
Parish Magazine Leaflets	537, 595
Porson, R., on I Jno. V, 7	56
Pulpit, A Profounder, and Simpler Services	594
Renaissance, The Christian	168
Resurrection, The and Psychical Research	540
Sheppard's (Canon) Criticism of Theological Colleges	275
Suicide and Euthanasia	708
The Three Hours' Service	652
The Curate and the M.U.	109
The Two Ways	106
Tennyson, The Modernism of his Father's Faith	168
United Church, A Sketch of	109

INDEX III. SUBJECTS.

Note.—Reviews of Books will be found under 'Reviews,' and bear the title of the books themselves, and not the headings under which they were reviewed.

	PAGE
A Better Way than Revolt	145
Academic Theology, and the Demand for Change	607
Ambassador's Chaplain, An	90
America's First Bishop	136
Apologetic, A New	7
Appeal-Court, A Final	663
Ascension, The, a Re-interpretation ...	190
Atonement in History, The	477
Austria, Religious Conditions in	205
Birth-control, and the Bishop of Ely ...	58
Bishop, The, His Office and Work ...	344
Bishops, Appointment of	604
Booth, General, His Work	14
Calendar Reform and a Fixed Easter ...	546
Catholicism with Freedom	682
Catholic Modernism	446
Charnwood (Lord) and Wolmer (Lord) on the Church and State Report ...	661
Christian Thought, The New Background	220
Christianity and Science	614
—— and Communism	654
—— The Essence of	298
—— The Meaning of	178
Christology in the Twentieth Century ...	675
Christologies in the N.T.	676
Church Assembly, The:	
Important Measures passed by ...	393
Its Status and Functions	386
Its Unrepresentative Character 397,	663
Church Courts	404
Church of England:	
And the Church of Scotland ...	34
As it might be	465
And other Christian Churches ...	453
Conflicting Ideals in	439
Doctrinal Characteristics	301
Essential Truths Taught by ...	310
Its Relation to the Nation	320
Measures to be taken against Defaulters	335
Obligations of Membership	337
Problems of Membership	332
The Modernist Task in the	475
Worship (Public) in	421
Church, The:	
and Marriage. The 1935 Report ...	171
and the coming Social Order ...	545
and People. Widening Gulf between	27
A Vital and Comprehensive	119
Its Relation to the Nation	320
Need of Study of its Doctrine ...	298
Of the Living God	290
Of Scotland and C. of E.	34
Church and State, Report 598, 606,	661
—— —— The Three Attitudes to ...	185
Church Pensions Measure, Its Defects ...	394
Church Times and English Modernism ...	4
Clergy, The Training of	370
Communism and Socialism	660
Conference, The 1935:	
Editor's Preface	281
President's Address	290
Practical and Dominant Emphasis of	288
Conscientious Objectors to War	64
Cranmer's Theology	307
Creeds and their Interpretation	214
Davidson, Archbishop, and Ritualism ...	556
—— —— Life of	550
Della Valle, The Travels of	198
Dilemma, The Christian's	63
Dramatic Element in Christian Worship	484
Easter, A Fixed	546
Election of Bishops in the 2nd Century	512
Erastus and Erastianism	182
Euthanasia, Voluntary	543
Evil, The Problem of	23
Evolutionary Christianity	660
Evolutionary Point of View, The Demand for	657
Execution of Criminals	629
Fasting Communion	62
Fisher, Bishop, Scholar and Saint ...	70
Free Speech on the Continent	525
German Christians	562
—— Faith Movement	563
Germany, Christianity and Paganism in	559
Gifford Lectures, 1932-1934	7
God, How has He spoken	669
God save the King	57

PAGE

- (Bishop) and Anglicanism 490
—— and Modernism 496
bel Criticism, The latest phase ... 115
bel, Sources of the Second 664
between Church and People, The ... 27
rnation, The, in Christian Theology 681
llibilism and Freedom 127
Memoriam:
F. C. Burkitt 113
A. Caldecott 687
W. J. Mann 639
isition, The raison d'etre of 519
s Christ and Politics 654
g George V, The Religion of 597
cial Committee of the Privy Council 411, 603
rence of Arabia (Sermon) 236
man, The English 360
man's Attitude to the Church, The ... 360
ral Evangelicanism 445
gford (Dr.) and the Tablet 547
bla, A Modern 14
bride's (Professor) Challenge ... 177
riage and Marriage Law (Reports of Joint Committee) 326
- Problems and our Church Authorities 169
rx, Karl. His Dialectical Materialism 574
. Conference for 1936 550
- The 22nd (Editorial) 281
dernism and Bishop Gore 496
dernist Literature 2
dernist Message, as understood by a layman 78
dernists' Task in the C. of E., The ... 475
inands and the Study of Theology ... 377
al Social Teaching 618
liamentary Veto, Abolition of ... 601
son in Revolt, A 82
toral Tribunals 604

PAGE

Pattison, Mark, Jubilee of his Memoirs 566
Peace Appeal, The Archbishops' 541
Politics and Religion 653
Politics and Jesus Christ 654
Primacy, A Notable 550
Procreation 635
Puzzle, My 62
Reformers, The English, Their Changes of Doctrine 303
Reformation, The, and British Freedom 512
Religion of King George V 597
Religion, Natural or Supernatural ... 672
Resurrection, The Distinction between Fact and Method 60
Revelation, Is it Supernatural? 670
—— The Meaning of 669
—— and Discovery 684
Ritual in Public Worship 488
Russia To-day 659
Sacredness of Life, The, as a Modernist sees it 628
Scotland, Church of and C. of E. ... 34
—— —— Today 39
Self-sacrifice for Others 631
Serfdom in the Middle Ages 515
Social Teaching, The Papal 618
Spiritual Power in State and Church ... 606
Spiritual Liberty, The Aspiration for in the C. of E. 662
—— —— in the Church of Scotland ... 663
Sport, Taking Life for 634
Suicide. Is it justifiable? 633
Terry, E. An Ambassador's Chaplain ... 90
Travels in India of Pietro della Valle ... 198
Training of the Clergy 370
Theological Education 607
Three Hours' Service, The 506
Two Ways, The 1
Worship, Public, in the C. of E. 421
—— —— The Dramatic Element in ... 484

INDEX IV. REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

PAGE

n, G. F. *Christ the Victorious* (Macleohose. 1935. 5/-) 694
us, S. *Truth and Tradition* (Angus & Robertson. 4/6) 99
her, J. C. *Faiths Men Live By* (Nelson. 1935. $3) 589
raclough, G. *Papal Provisions* (Blackwell. 1935. 10/6) 645
ry, F. R. *The Relevance of the Church* (Nisbet. 1935. 7/6) 529
lerby, J. R. *The Conflict of Values* (R. Clay & Sons. 1933. 6/-) ... 103
loc, Hilaire. *Milton* (Cassell. 1935. 12/-) 531
keney, E. H. *Julius Africanus. A Letter to Origen* (privately printed. 1935) 250
quet, A. C. *The Doctrine of God* (Heffer. 1934. 7/6) 104

PAGE

Brundit, D. F. *Is the Resurrection True?* (Philip Alan. 1934. 5/-) 46
Bultmann, R., & Kundsin, K. *Form Criticism* (Willett Clarke. 1934. $2) ... 697
Cameron, A. M. *Civilisation and the Unemployed* (S.C.M. 1934. 3/6) ... 690
Campbell, A. *In Praise of St. Francis* (Skeffington. 1934. 2/-) 156
Day, A. E. *Jesus and Human Personality* (Abingdon Press. 1935. $2) ... 268
Davies, W., & Grace Harvey. *Music and Worship* (Eyre & Spottiswood. 1935. 6/-) 256
Dearmer, P. *Our National Church* (Nisbet. 1934. 6/-) 44
Dewey, J. *A Common Faith* (Yale University Press. 1934) 704
Dudden, F. H. *The Life and Times of St. Ambrose* (Clarendon Press. 1935. 35/-) 646

PAGE

Findlay, A. C. *The Acts of the Apostles* (S.C.M. 1935. 2/6) 251
Fosdick, D. *The Secret of Victorious Living* (S.C.M. 1935. 6/-) 269
Grane, W. L. *War—its Curse and Cure* (Allen & Unwin. 1935. 4/6) ... 648
Gray, A. H. *About People* (S.C.M. 1935. 3/6) 708
Gregory, T. S. *An Unfinished Universe* (Faber. 1935. 8/6) 259
Hardwick, J. C. *What to Believe* (Simpkin, Marshall. 1935. 7/6) 584
Harford, J. B. *Studies in the Book of Ezekiel* (C.U.P. 1935. 7/6) ... 587
Holzmeister, U. *Chronologia Vitae Christi* (Romae. 1933) 157
Horton, W. M. *Realistic Theology* (Harper. $2) 152
Hudson, C. E. *Preface to a Christian Sociology* (Allen & Unwin. 1935. 4/6) 690
Hunkin, J. W. *Is it Reasonable to Believe?* (Hodder & Stoughton. 1935. 3/-) 247
Iremonger & others. *The Way to God* (S.C.M. 1935. 3/6) 265
James, F., & others. *The Beginnings of Our Religion* (S.P.C.K. 1934. 3/6) 267
James, E. O. *The O.T. in the Light of Anthropology* (S.P.C.K. 1935. 4/-) 700
Keller, A. *Religion and the European Mind* (Lutterworth Press. 1934. 6/-) 252
Lake, Kirsopp. *Paul, his Heritage and Legacy* (Christophers. 1934. 6/-) ... 101
Landau, R. *God is my Adventure* (Ivor Nicholson & Watson. 1935. 10/6) 707
Lewis, E. *A Christian Manifesto* (S.C.M., 1934. 6/-) 97
Lofthouse, W. F. *The Father and the Son* (S.C.M. 1934. 7/6) 149
Luce, K. *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (C.U.P. 1934. 7/6) 51
Lumb, J. R. *Religious Instruction in the Elementary School* (S.P.C.K. 1934. 3/6) 150
McCabe, J. *Selected Works of Voltaire* (Watts & Co. 1935. 1/-) 701
Mackay, Dr. *The Indus Civilisation* (Lovat Dickson & Thompson. 1935. 6/-) ... 534
McCallum, J. R. *Abailard's Ethics* (Blackwell. 1934. 6/-) 155

PAGE

McDougall, W. *Religion and the Sciences of Life* (Methuen. 1934. 8/6) ... 4
Owen, E. C. *The Fading Margin. A Study in Evolutionary and Christian Ethics* (Blackwell. 1934. 5/-) 26
Pendlebury, J. D. S. *Tell-el-Amarna* (Lovat Dickson & Thompson. 1935. 6/-) ... 26
Perry, W. J. *The Primordial Ocean* (Methuen. 1936. 15/-) 65
Pinto, V. de S. *Peter Sterry, Platonist and Puritan* (C.U.P. 1934. 12/6) ... 58
Piper, O. *Recent Developments in German Protestantism* (S.C.M. 1934. 4/-) 25
Ratcliffe, E. *St. Paul and his Writings in the Light of To-day* (Allenson. 1934. 5/-) 15
Raven, C. E. *Is War Obsolete?* (Allen & Unwin. 1935. 4/6) 64
Richardson, R. D. *The Gospel of Modernism.* 2nd edition (Skeffington. 1935. 6/-) 63
Richardson, Alan. *Creeds in the Making* (S.C.M. 1935. 2/6) 53
—— —— *The Redemption of Modernism* (Skeffington. 1935. 2/6) 70
Spencer, F. A. M. *The Future Life* (Hamish Hamilton. 1935. 7/6) 24
Spencer, M. & Workman, H. W. *Spiritual Healing* (S.C.M. 1934. 2/6) ... 9
Sykes, N. *Church and State in England in the 18th Century* (C.U.P. 1934. 21/-) 58
Thompson, A. H. *Bede, His Life, Times and Writings* (Clarendon Press. 1935. 15/-) 69
Townsend, J. C. *The Modern Approach to the O.T.* (Allen & Unwin. 1935. 5/-) 70
Truman, N. *The Care of Churches* (Philip Allan. 1935. 3/6) 53
Wade, G. W. *The Documents of the N.T.* (Murky & Co. 1934. 10/6) 26
Walpole, H. *Captain Nicholas* (Macmillan, 7/6) 5
Webb, C. C. J. *The Historical Element in Religion* (Allen & Unwin. 1935. 4/6) 64
Wilson, A. *Walks and Talks* (O.U.P. 1934. 5/-) 25
Wood, H. G. *Christianity and the Nature of History* (C.U.P. 1934. 6/-) ... 24